used

A MANUAL OF

CHRISTIAN ETHICS

By

LEANDER S. KEYSER, D. D.

Professor of Systematic Theology
in Hamma Divinity School, Wittenberg College,
Springfield, Ohio

Author of

"A System of Christian Evidence," "A System of General Ethics," "The Problem of Origins," "Man's First Disobedience," etc.

THE MASTER'S COLLEGE
POWELL LIBRARY
SANTA CLARITA, CA 91321

1926
THE LUTHERAN LITERARY BOARD
BURLINGTON, IOWA

PROPERTY OF THE
LOS ANGELES BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Copyright, 1926
Lutheran Literary Board
Burlington, Iowa

THE FOREWORD

Primarily intended as a textbook for Christian colleges, seminaries and other schools, this manual may also be used by the general reader. Some technical terms have had to be employed, but usually they occur in such contexts as to be readily understood.

Both the publisher and the author felt that it would be better to issue a manual rather than an extended treatise. This fact will account for the brevity with which many subjects are treated. It is believed, however, that a textbook which is suggestive is better than one that aims to be exhaustive, as the former method gives opportunity for the instructor and his students to develop the various topics for themselves and engage in class discussions.

The author believes that the same general outline can be used for unfolding systems of both Natural Ethics and Christian Ethics. The Christian system is true and rational, and hence no general scheme can be fundamental which does not agree with the teaching of the Christian Scriptures.

The author knows of no other ethical system that is built up on the plan here employed; yet it will be seen that the Christian World-view, which is, of course, truly theistic, lends itself readily to the working out of a methodology that is fundamental and that gives proper and proportionate place to all the numerous data of morality.

In Christian Ethics moral distinctions must be clearly drawn; they must in nowise be blurred. It is hoped that this book will prove that Christian morality is as stalwart and upstanding as it is gentle and gracious.

Springfield, Ohio,
July 23, 1926.

L. S. K.

GENERAL OUTLINE

PART I
THEORETICAL ETHICS

I. THE ETHICAL INTRODUCTION
II. THE ETHICAL SOURCE
III. THE ETHICAL LAW
IV. THE ETHICAL ANTITHESIS
V. THE ETHICAL RESTORATION

PART II
PRACTICAL ETHICS

I. INTRODUCTORY DATA
II. MAN'S CHIEF DUTIES
    1. *Duties to God*
    2. *Duties to Nature*
    3. *Duties to Oneself*
    4. *Duties to One's Fellowmen*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I
THEORETICAL ETHICS

DIVISION I
THE ETHICAL INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I

		Page
I.	DEFINITIONS	9
II.	TERMS AND THEIR DERIVATION	13
III.	THE ETHICAL SPHERE	14
IV.	ETHICS AS A SCIENCE	18
V.	THE NORM OF AUTHORITY	21
VI.	METHODOLOGY	21

CHAPTER II

VII.	HISTORICAL SKETCH	21
VIII.	VARIED RELATIONS OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS	25

DIVISION II
THE ETHICAL SOURCE

CHAPTER III

I.	DEFINITION	34
II.	THE CHRISTIAN VIEW	34
III.	HUMANISTIC THEORIES	39

Page

DIVISION III
THE ETHICAL LAW

CHAPTER IV

I. CONNECTING LINKS 50
II. PROOFS OF A MORAL ORDER IN NATURE 51
III. BIBLICAL TEACHING REGARDING THE MORAL LAW 52
IV. MORAL AGENTS UNDER THE LAW 54

CHAPTER V

IV. MORAL AGENTS UNDER THE LAW (continued) 63

CHAPTER VI

V. JUSTIFICATION OF BIBLICAL ETHICS 70

DIVISION IV
THE ETHICAL ANTITHESIS

CHAPTER VII

I. CONNECTING LINKS 78
II. DEFINITION AND TERM (the term Sin) 79
III. THE FACT OF SIN 79

CHAPTER VIII

IV. THE GENESIS OF SIN 83
V. THE EFFECTS OF SIN 89

DIVISION V
THE ETHICAL RESTORATION

CHAPTER IX

I. CONNECTING LINK 92
II. THE RESTORATION EFFECTED BY REDEMPTION 93
III. ETHICAL PREPARATION FOR REDEMPTION 94
IV. THE REDEMPTION THROUGH CHRIST 95
V. THE OBJECTS OF REDEMPTION 99

CHAPTER X

Page
VI. THE APPLICATION OF REDEMPTION 101
VII. THE CONSUMMATION OF REDEMPTION 106

PART II
PRACTICAL ETHICS

DIVISION I
INTRODUCTORY DATA

CHAPTER XI

I. DEFINITION 108
II. RELATION TO THEORETICAL ETHICS 108
III. SUBJECT-MATTER OF PRACTICAL ETHICS 109
IV. BASIS OF THE CHRISTIANLY ETHICAL LIFE 109
V. THE CHRISTIAN CONCEPTION OF DUTY 110
VI. MAN'S CHIEF DUTIES 111

CHAPTER XII

VI. MAN'S CHIEF DUTIES (continued) 114

CHAPTER XIII

VI. MAN'S CHIEF DUTIES (continued) 120

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 133

A MANUAL OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS

PART I
THEORETICAL ETHICS

DIVISION I
The Ethical Introduction

CHAPTER I

I. DEFINITIONS.

1. Importance of a Correct Definition.

At the beginning of any discipline aiming at a scientific presentation, the importance of a correct definition can hardly be over-estimated. It is like taking a bird's-eye view of a landscape and determining its scope, general contour and special position relative to other areas, before examining it in detail. If we can agree on a clear-cut definition of our subject at the start, it will be of distinct advantage in all our subsequent investigations.

2. Definition of General Ethics.

General Ethics is the science which treats of the sources, principles and practice of right and wrong in the light of nature and reason.

3. Definition of Christian Ethics.

Christian Ethics is the science which treats of the sources, principles and practice of right and wrong in the light of the Holy Scriptures, in addition to the light of nature and reason.

4. Defective Definitions.

(1) "Ethics is the science of conduct: it considers the actions of human beings in reference to their rightness or wrongness, their tendency to good or evil."[1]

This definition limits Ethics to the sphere of "conduct" or "actions," and is therefore faulty. In reality, our science deals primarily with principles, motives and character. The Bible goes deeper: "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he;" "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." The inside of the platter, as well as the outside, is to be made clean.

A man's external conduct might be correct according to all the canons of conventional ethics, and he might even simulate Christian morality quite successfully, at least for a time; yet he might be a very immoral person, because his motives are evil. It is the inner purpose that determines the real character of the actor. "Ethics is quite as much a study of character as it is of conduct."[2]

The above definition also lacks fundamental reality, because it deals only with man, and does not go back to the ultimate source and home of the right and the good. That is, it has no real philosophical foundation.

(2) "Ethics, or Moral Science, is the science of man's life of duty, or what man ought to do in the present world."[3]

1. Mackenzie, *Manual of Ethics*, p. 1.
2. Hyslop, *The Elements of Ethics*, p. 3.
3. Gregory, *Christian Ethics*, p. 13.

This definition has at least three defects: First, it limits ethics to *doing*, whereas our discipline has fully as much to say about *being;* second, Ethics should not be limited to a life of mere duty, because that makes it a constant strain and task, whereas it has just as much to say about privilege and joy: the truly ethical life is, after all, the most lyrical life; third, no good reason can be given for limiting the sphere of Ethics to the present life: it may well have an outlook into futurity, and, indeed, it *must* have, to make right being and right doing worth while.

5. Definition of the Text Justified.

It is believed that the definition given under paragraph 2 (also 3) above can be maintained. Let us note some reasons: (1) It clearly marks off the ethical sphere, namely, the realm of the *right*, and its antithesis, the *wrong*; and this conception is easily grasped by human intuition; (2) It goes to the root of the matter by seeking the ultimate *source* of the right and the wrong; (3) The truly ethical must have its dwelling place in the inner character of the moral agent — that is, in his *principles;* (4) Yet the ethical in principle must blossom out in *conduct* in order to verify itself as genuine and prove of benefit to the world; as the Scriptures teach, men should "let their light shine;" they should not "hide it under a bushel."

6. An Objection Answered.

The question may be raised whether a science of the wrong can be formulated, the objection being that wrong is the anarchistic element in the world. Our reply is:

First, the ulimate principle and source of the wrong can be investigated just as can other facts in the world, and in doing this we are obliged to employ scientific, inductive and

philosophical methods; second, although the wrong *per se* is the principle of moral anarchy, yet, on account of the superior power of God and the right, evil has not succeeded in throwing the world into chaos; third, for this reason, the wrong — or sin — is capable of scientific treatment and classification: thus, the theologian is able to schematize sins into various genera and species, such as original sin and actual sin, sins of omission and commission, inner sins and overt sins, etc.

Therefore we conclude that the definition of Ethics should, in order to be thoroughgoing, include the term *wrong* as well as the term *right.*

7. Other Good Definitions.

"Ethics is the science of rectitude and duty; it treats of the right and its obligations."[4]

"The subject-matter of Ethics is morality, the phenomenon of right and wrong."[5]

"Ethics may be defined as the science of morality, or the science of moral distinctions."[6]

"Ethics . . . the science of moral personality and moral good."[7]

The foregoing definitions are all excellent, because they properly delimit our science and make clear its subject-matter. However, on the whole, we think that the inclusion of the simple terms, *right* and *wrong,* is wise, chiefly because of their simplicity and of most people's ability to perceive their content.

4. Valentine, *Theoretical Ethics,* p. 15.
5. Thilly, *Introduction to Ethics,* p. 5.
6. De Laguna, *Introduction to the Science of Ethics,* pp. 3, 4.
7. Hyslop, *The Elements of Ethics,* p. 4.

II. TERMS AND THEIR DERIVATION.

1. The Term Ethics.

This term is derived from the Greek, *ethica*, moral, which comes from *ēthos*, character, which, according to Aristotle, came from the root, *ethos*, meaning custom or habit.

However, the science of Ethics, as it has now been developed, should not be determined by the etymology of the word, for it means far more than merely the habits or social convenances of the people. The right and the wrong have a real and distinctive basis in the very structure of the universe, and thus do not grow in the shallow soil of mere arbitrary social customs.

2. Moral Science and Moral Philosophy.

In former days Ethics was called *Moral Science* or *Moral Philosophy*. The word "moral" is derived from the Latin *mos* (adjective, *moralis*), which also means custom or usage. Here again it will be seen that the term "moral" has come to have a higher significance than its derivation would indicate. The same change has taken place in the meaning of many other important words, such as "virtue" and "conscience."

The terms, "Moral Science" and "Moral Philosophy," are no longer in vogue, but have given place to the briefer and more descriptive term, "Ethics," just as we say "Physics" instead of "Physical Science."

3. Deontology.

This term has been suggested as a designation for our science.[8] Its derivation is *to deon*, what is due, and *logos*,

8. See Valentine, *Theoretical Ethics*, p. 16 (footnote); Davis, *Elements of Ethics*, p. 36.

discourse; hence a discourse about duty. The term, however, has never come into vogue; and it would not be an acceptable one, because Ethics deals with right, privileges, moral joy and uplift, as well as with tasks and duties.

III. THE ETHICAL SPHERE.

1. Definition.

By the ethical sphere is meant the whole realm of right and wrong, or, in other words, of morality.

2. Its Distinctive Data.

These data consist of all moral phenomena, such as right and wrong, moral distinctions, duty, the functioning of conscience, the operations of the will in choosing between right and wrong, etc.

That these data are distinctive goes almost without saying with people whose thinking is unspoiled by bemisting speculations. For example, the word *right* has a very specific meaning; so has the word *wrong*. When you say, "An act is right," you do not mean that it is merely pleasurable, for it may not give pleasure; neither do you mean the same as that it is useful, because, at least for the time being, it may not seem to be useful, judged by the usual meaning of that term. The faculty of conscience deals with something very different from mere sense perception, or mere intellectual processes. You say that you are able to solve such and such a mathematical problem; but when the question arises as to whether it is *right* for you to solve it just now, or do something else that may be more urgent, a very different concept springs up in the mind.

Not only are ethical data distinctive; they also stand out clearly in the mind — at least, the mind that is ethically fit.

You are just as conscious of right and wrong as you are of many other facts of life. If you do right, something within you approves; if you do wrong, it disapproves. And sometimes the chastisements of conscience are more keenly felt than any other kind of emotion.

Moreover, morality is so paramount in importance, and has so much to do with individual, social, national and racial welfare, that its data stand out clearly in the human mind, just as they ought.

3. Its Distinctive Questions.

In our science the specific questions are: "Is it right?" and its opposite, "Is it wrong?" Apply those questions to any status, situation and event, and you will know at once whether it belongs to the ethical sphere or not. In physical science the distinctive question is, "Is it physical?" In psychology we ask, "Is it mental?" In philosophy the question arises, "Is it the ultimate reality?"[9] In Ethics the interrogation, "Is it right?" is the deciding one.

4. Its Distinctive Vocabulary.

Another evidence of a specific ethical realm is the fact that language contains so many words with ethical significance. These words, too, are of the highest quality, and stand for the finest and most important concepts and truths. Try to eliminate all the ethical terminology from the English language, and see how it would be impoverished. It may be profitable to analyze some of our ethical words.

(1) There is the word *ought*. What an outstanding word! It marks Kant's great "categorical imperative," meaning the command of duty and obligation. When men

9. Philosophy deals with experience as a whole (cf. Jevons, *Philosophy: What is It?*

know that they ought to do a thing, that should be the end of all argument. A well-known speaker, Dr. Joseph Cook, a number of years ago used this effective illustration: If you should place the whole world on one side of the scales and the word "ought" on the other, the word would tip the beam. Again, if the whole physical universe were likewise balanced against our potent ethical word, the word would outweigh the universe.

(2) The word *virtue* is another forceful word. From the Latin *vir*, man, it originally pertained only to masculinity, and thus meant *manlike* quality; but in our day it has a more purely ethical significance, so that we may speak just as appropriately of a virtuous woman as of a virtuous man.

Like a good many other words, the word virtue may be used in both an ethical and non-ethical sense, *e. g.*: "He is a man of great virtue"— ethical; "That medicine as a great virtue" (curative efficacy)— non-ethical. As a rule, we can distinguish the ethical or the non-ethical sense of a word from its context.

(3) The word *good* is an interesting ethical word. It may also be used in more than one sense: "He is a good man"— ethical; "This is a good apple"— non-ethical. A comparatively young child would be likely to sense the difference intuitively, although he might not be able to express it.[10]

10. In dealing with the word "good" Herbert Spencer revealed his lack of clear ethical discernment: for he seemed to think that, when we speak of a good or bad knife, gun or house, we mean the same thing as when we speak of a good or bad man! This is an instance in which speculation dulled the native intuitions of a great man's mind. Had Mr. Spencer but remembered the simple fact that we use many words in different senses, according to the context and circumstances, he would have been saved confusion of thought. Hyslop (ut supra, pp. 94, 95) criticizes Spencer acutely.

(4) The word *moral* is one of our outstanding ethical words. It may be used in a variety of ways. If we speak of a *moral* man or a *moral* cause, it means distinctively that such a man or cause is of the right character. On the other hand, when we speak of a *moral science*, the word moral connotes a scientific discussion of the *wrong* as well as of the *right*.

Prefixes to the word moral cause some interesting varieties of meaning. We call a block of wood *non-moral* or *unmoral*, but could not properly call it *immoral*. However, we would not call a rational person *non-moral* or *unmoral*, but either *moral* or *immoral*, according as his character is good or bad.

(5) Although so many quotation-marks may make our page look "choppy," let us make a list of ethical words, to prove the fundamental place they hold in our language and hence in our thought; for words, as we know, are the symbols of conceptions and ideas.

Observe the many ethical particles of every-day speech: "should," "would," "must," "will," "shall," "can," each of which conveys its peculiar shade of meaning in the ethical realm. The word "should" is only a milder term for "ought." Other distinctively ethical terms are: "right," "righteousness," "good," "rectitude," "virtue," "purity," "chastity," "holiness," "sanctity," "uprightness," "veracity," "probity," "honesty," "courage" (moral), "conscientiousness;" and their antitheses: "wrong," "evil," "sin," "unrighteousness," "wickedness," "vileness," "cowardice," "obliquity," "meanness," "mendacity," "perfidy," "two-facedness," etc. Besides, all the words that involve the action of the will bear a moral significance, like "freedom," "liberty," "choice," "volition," "decision," "steadfastness," "de-

termination," "firmness," and many more. Even their opposites, like "thralldom," "bondage," "indecision," "vacillation," and the like, connote an abuse of man's moral powers, and therefore have their ethical implications.

IV. ETHICS AS A SCIENCE.

1. It Deals with Observed Data.

Surely the facts of morality are not obscure. Of course, there are certain *lacunae* (dark places) in the moral realm, but the same is true in all science. Even Mr. Huxley, the professed agnostic, admitted that the mysteries of the Christian creed, including the incarnation, the virgin birth of Christ, the Trinity and the resurrection, were no more difficult and insoluble than are those of the physical realm.

But let us make some comparisons. You are just as conscious of moral conceptions and feelings as you are of sense perception. When you do right, you know it just as distinctly as you know when you see a tree on the campus or hear a bird singing in the tree. The testimony of conscience is just as vivid as is any other impingement upon the center of consciousness.[11]

Not only are the ethical data outstanding and clear, but they are of the very first importance; for civilization, however far advanced, cannot long endure unless it is founded on sound ethical principles and practices. "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people."

---

11. Frank Thilly (*Introduction to Ethics*, pp. 5, 6): "It is a fact that men call certain characters and actions moral and immoral, right and wrong, good and bad; that they approve of them and disapprove of them, express moral judgments upon them. . . . Now this fact is as capable and as worthy of investigation as any other fact in the universe and we need a science that will subject it to careful analysis." Also page 9: "That we place a value upon things, that we call them right or good, wrong or bad, is the important fact in Ethics; is what makes a science of Ethics possible."

A man might be a great scholar, yet, if he were immoral, he would not be a good and respected member of society. On the other hand, a man might have very little academic learning, yet, if he were of high moral character, he would have the respect of his fellowmen and might wield a large influence for good.

The man who closes his eyes to the outstanding and supremely important data of morality surely cannot be regarded as a true scientist; for empirical science must take all the facts into account. Think of casting away and ignoring all the moral data of human society! How one-sided and superficial that would be!

2. It Assembles the Observed Data Into a System.

This is another mark of science. It does more than merely observe facts. It tries to classify them, to orientate them into a system. And the scientific ethicist is able to do this with the facts he has observed and gathered together. No science has a better methodology than Ethics. In a work on physical science, the material is never thrown together hodgepodge, but is always arranged in the best order possible. Note that the data of right and wrong can be treated in the same systematic way.

3. It Makes Legitimate Inductions from the Data thus Assembled.

In doing this, it must be careful that it does not become too speculative. Yet no scientist can very well avoid drawing inductions from the facts he has accumulated and systematized, and as long as his inductions are valid, he has a right to consider them at least as the rational conclusions from the facts.

No one can deny that our science, like all others, must sometimes deal with and reason from a *priori* principles; but even so it should be understood that those principles are first based on the observed or empirical facts of nature and thought; then, having first been established by the *inductive* method, which is the recognized scientific method of the day, we have a right to use them in the *a priori* or *deductive* way, to see whether our inductions will account for any further facts that may be discovered. That is the method of all scientific processes today. A theory is employed as long as it explains all the facts; when it fails to explain any facts, it must be either modified or abandoned.

4. Ethics a normative science.

In contrast with physical science, Ethics is known as a *normative* science,[12] because it holds up a standard, rule or norm – that is, the ideal of moral good, by which all actual character and conduct are to be tested; whereas the physical sciences deal purely with things as they are, not with things as they ought to be.

However, it is not correct to say, "Ethics is the science of the ideal as contrasted with the actual," as one author phrases it. No; our science deals with actual conditions, and examines, classifies, and tries to give account of them. At the same time it also deals with what ought to be. Ethics has to do with both moral reality and moral ideality. It is an *is*-science as well as an *ought*-science. It is *normative* in the sense that the ideal standard is always upheld as the goal of moral endeavor.

---

12. See Mackenzie, *Manual of Ethics*, pp. 4-8, 20-22; Murray, *A Handbook of Christian Ethics*, pp. 1-3.

V. THE NORM OF AUTHORITY.

In the present work the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are regarded as the ultimate court of appeal. As will be shown later, it is the business of Christian Apologetics to vindicate the divine inspiration and authority of the Holy Scriptures, while Christian Ethics accepts the findings of its sister theological discipline and builds upon them. On the other hand, the high standard of morality inculcated by the Bible becomes, in turn, a cogent apologetic for its divine inspiration.[13]

VI. METHODOLOGY.

1. Definition.

Methodology is the scientific form adopted in classifying, co-ordinating and developing the data of any science either as a whole or in any of its branches. Its processes and results are employed whenever an attempt is made to organize and unfold a science. The scientific method is to find some unifying fact or principle around which to assemble the varied materials that have been collected.

2. Its Application to Ethics.

Every ethicist uses his own method. There can be no doubt that some methods are superior to others. Some deal with the subject more fundamentally and logically than do others. The methods of some writers are difficult to understand and remember, due to the fact that the material is not well arranged.

13. No one version is followed in quoting Biblical passages in this work. As a rule, the authorized version is preferred when it is correct. But the author sometimes follows other versions or ventures to give a translation of his own.

All that the author of this work can claim for his method is that he has tried to be fundamental, logical and progressive in his assembling of the ethical material. The General Outline on an early page will indicate the plan that has been pursued. Then in the body of the work various divisions and sub-divisions have been made, so that both instructor and student may use the material in the most effective way both in preparing the lessons and in conducting the sessions in the classroom.

Although the author is not a little indebted to Dr. Milton Valentine's profound and masterly work[14] for some fundamental suggestions, he does not believe that any other ethical system has been grounded and built up according to the plan here used.

Part I deals with "Theoretical Ethics," and includes definitions, relations, the ultimate source of right, the objective law of right, the origin and nature of wrong, the facts of moral agency and moral distinctions, thus laying down the foundational principles of morality. Part II, "Practical Ethics," seeks to apply these principles to the conduct of human life. The foundation and center of the whole system lies in the section which treats of "The Ultimate Source of Right;" for if men will think the matter through, they must logically come to the conclusion that the only world-view which affords a real and fundamental basis for a moral economy is the theistic world-view. As will be shown in due course, morality can be predicated only of rational personalities.

14. *Theoretical Ethics.*

CHAPTER II

VII. HISTORICAL SKETCH.

1. Moral Intuitions.

Moral intuitions *date from man's creation, being innate.* Both history and reason prove this to be so. As far back as any historical records can be found, men were moral beings, however undeveloped. Reason and science also teach that the moral could not have evolved from the non-moral merely by resident forces, for that would have violated the principle of causality, which teaches that no effect can be greater than its cause. Hence human morality both in character and conduct existed long before any science of Ethics was attempted. The same may be said of all the other sciences – for example, botany, astronomy, mathematics, psychology and theology.

2. Hebrew Ethics.

Among the Hebrews *all men* were considered capable of virtue, and a very high standard of morality was inculcated by their prophets, although the practice of the people fell far below it.

If we accept the Old Testament as a record of veritable history, man was created a moral agent, able to discern between right and wrong, and determine himself toward them by the use of his will, and was subjected to a moral test, which was placed before him in the form of "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil," of which he was forbidden to eat. Whether the narrative is actual history or not, it is evident that the Hebrews *believed* that man was created a

moral being. To many profound minds the exalted character of this ethical conception is one of the convincing proofs that the Bible is a divinely inspired book. The fact is also to be noted that there was a progressive development and revelation of ethical ideals in Hebrew history, culminating in the marvelous ethical teachings of Christianity.

3. Heathen Ethics.

Among the heathen peoples *ethical ideals also prevailed,* sometimes to a high degree with their leaders; but usually *only a certain favored class* were considered capable of virtue, while the rest were regarded as little better than animals, fitted only to be slaves. This exclusive, or, we might say aristocratic, kind of ethics, was taught even in Plato's work, *The Ideal Republic.*

4. Earliest Scientific Efforts.

The first attempts at a scientific and philosophic treatment of morality were made by Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. Earlier sporadic efforts were made by the Sophists, but the results were almost negligible, and left little permanent impress on human history.

5. Later Attempts.

Later attempts at giving a philosophical and rational account of morality were made by the Epicureans (Hedonists) and Stoics. Among the Greeks we may mention Epicurus and Zeno, and among the Romans, Seneca, Cicero, Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius.

6. From the First to the Seventeenth Centuries.

From the establishment of Christianity to the seventeenth century, Ethics was usually included in Theology, and therefore was called Christian or Theological Ethics.

7. From the Seventeenth Century to Date.

Since the beginning of the seventeenth century, Ethics has taken a prominent place among the so-called *normative* sciences, along with Logic, Esthetics, etc. Christian Ethics has become a separate science in distinction from Christian Dogmatics, because the moral data were apt to be slighted when they were treated in connection with doctrines. Systems of Natural or General Ethics, based merely on nature and reason, have been developed by many writers in these modern times.[1]

VIII. VARIED RELATIONS OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS.

No branch of science stands alone. All sciences are organically related. One might say that there is a fraternity of the sciences. The world is a cosmos, not a chaos; a unity in diversity. This fact makes scientific knowledge possible, and its pursuit an unending delight.

1. To Physical Science.

Our science gladly accepts whatever has been clearly established by research in the physical realm. It does not ignore, much less despise, these verified results. Indeed, to put aside any truth through fear or prejudice would be unethical, and for that very reason would be subversive of ethical science.

Yet the ethicist should not be hasty in accepting the mere speculations and unproved deductions of scientific men. There is a great deal of so-called science that is not really empirical, but is built on hypotheses that are far from being

1. For a number of the facts stated in this sketch we are indebted to Valentine, *Theoretical Ethics*, pp. 17-20.

Library
The Master's College

validated. So the ethicist will make haste slowly in dealing with scientific theories. In these days, however, it would be impossible to treat the data of ethics thoroughly without at some points indicating the bearing of the theory of evolution upon the moral economy.

2. To Psychology.

There is a vital sense in which Ethics is a division of mental science, because the moral faculties of man are a fundamental part of his psychical constitution. If the ethical sphere were limited to the moral nature of man, our science would be only a branch of psychology; but the ethical sphere has a wider scope than man's mental make-up, because it investigates the ultimate source and the objective law of right. Thus, while Ethics and Psychology overlap and integrate in most intimate ways, each has its specific field of investigation.

The following outline of the human mind will prove helpful, we hope, in indicating man's outstanding moral powers. For proper moral functioning the whole mind is necessary, but the *Conscience* and the *Will* are especially essential to moral action. In the following outline the places of these mental powers are indicated.

OUTLINE OF THE HUMAN MIND

I. THE INTELLECT.

1. The Senses:

(1) Sight; (2) Hearing; (3) Touch; (4) Smell; (5) Taste; (6) Other senses according to some psychologists.

2. The Intuition:

(1) Cognition of outward reality.

(2) Cognition of self: self-consciousness.
(3) Cognition of time and space.
(4) Cognition of cause and effect.
(5) Cognition of axioms.
(6) Cognition of truth and error.
(7) Cognition of beauty and repulsiveness: Esthetic Faculty.
(8) *Cognition of Right and Wrong: Conscience as Perception.*
(9) Cognition of God: theistic intuition.

3. The Understanding:
(1) Reflection.
(2) Memory.
(3) Imagination.
(4) Scientific Faculty.
(5) Logical Faculty.
(6) Philosophical Faculty.

II. THE SENSIBILITIES (Emotions, Feelings).
1. The Sentient Emotions:
2. The Psychical Emotions:
3. The Intuitional Emotions:
(1) Affectional.
(2) Esthetic.
(3) Scientific and philosophical.
(4) *Ethical: Conscience as Feeling; the Moral Sense.*
(5) Theistic.

III. THE WILL.
1. The Will in Liberty:
(1) The power of attention.
(2) The power of choice.
(3) The power of execution.

2. The Will in Action:
   (1) Through the Sense.
   (2) Through the Understanding.
   (3) Through the Intuition.
   (4) In the Emotions.

A distinction is here worth making: Psychology studies the human mind with a *mental* interest; Ethics with a *moral* interest. In psychology the chief question is, "How does the mind function?" in Ethics, "Is it *right* for the mind to function in this or that way?"[2]

3. To Philosophy.

The sciences of General and Christian Ethics cannot avoid entering the field of philosophy to some extent. They must try to solve the problems of the ultimate source of right, the basis of the moral law and the moral imperative over man; and these are problems which Philosophy, too, must canvass. However, the difference between the two disciplines is this: Philosophy seeks to solve the ethical problem, that is, in what the good consists and what is its basis; but, having done this, it passes on to consider its other problems, the problem of being (Ontology), the prob-

2. The reader will observe that the foregoing is an outline of pure psychology; it is not physiology with a little psychology as a by-product or with mind as a mere epiphenomenon. The author is a firm believer in dualism and in the theory of the interaction of the mind and the body, which, he holds, are two distinct entities, although vitally connected during this earthly life. Let any person analyze his own experience, and note whether the body does not affect the mind, and the mind in turn the body. For an able and convincing vindication of dualism and interaction read Dr. James Bissett Pratt's book, *Matter and Spirit* (1922). Of course, not all the minute psychical processes are indicated in the outline given above, but these are the outstanding ones, as any one may know by analyzing the action of his own mind.

lem of knowledge (Epistemology), the problem of personality, etc.[3]

On the other hand, Theoretical Ethics tries to solve the problem of right and wrong, and then proceeds to assemble and organize all the data of morality into a system, making it a science as well as a philosophy. For the foregoing reasons the discipline of Philosophy is of much value to the student of Ethics, affording him mental training, and at the same time throwing much light on the profounder problems of our science. This distinction should also be made: there is a difference for thought and life between a merely *philosophical* interest and an *ethical* interest in the world.

4. To Christian Dogmatics.

Christian Dogmatics is a system of doctrine drawn from the Bible and developed in the light of knowledge and reason. Practically all the *Loci* of Christian Dogmatics and Christian Ethics pervade and ramify one another, and can be distinguished only in thought. Every dogma has its ethical aspect or quality. Dogmatics asks, "What is the doctrine of God?" Ethics, "What is the moral nature of God?" Dogmatics inquires, "What is the doctrine of the person of Christ?" Ethics, "Is Christ holy, good and pure?"

So intimate is the relation between the two disciplines that some theologians have objected to their being treated separately;[4] and it must be admitted that there is considerable overlapping. However, when Christian doctrine and morality are treated together in one science, one or the other is apt to be slighted or neglected, according to the interest of the author. Thus we believe that they should be treated

3. See Hibben, *The Problems of Philosophy.*

4. Especially Sartorious in his truly great book, *The Doctrine of Divine Love.*

as separate disciplines, although their vital relation should be constantly borne in mind.

5. To Christian Apologetics.

Here, too, the relation is most vital. As a rule, Christian Ethics may accept the findings of Apologetics, and build its system upon them. If the Apologist holds stalwart views of the Bible and the Christian system, the Ethicist who follows him will make the Bible his ultimate court of appeal. Should he be a liberalist, his ethical system will be built on human reason first of all, while the Bible will be appealed to only when it fits into the subjective views of the author.

Although Christian Ethics as a rule follows Apologetics, yet it will, in turn, constitute a cogent apologetic for the Bible and Christianity by its presentation of the pure morality they inculcate. The high standard of moral teaching in the Bible, compared with ethnic systems, is a powerful argument for its divine inspiration and authority.

6. To Theological Encyclopedia.

This discipline is intended to give a general survey of the whole field of theological science, with a systematic arrangement of its several branches and a discussion of their mutual relations. It may be well here to present the main outline of our system of Theological Encyclopedia,[5] so that the student may clearly see the position occupied by our science:

I. Introductory Data.

II. Main Divisions.

1. *Exegetical Theology.*
2. *Historical Theology.*

5. See the author's *Theological Outlines and Theses,* pp. 4, 5, a text used in his classroom.

3. *Systematic Theology.*
   (1) Biblical Theology.
   (2) Christian Dogmatics.
   (3) Christian Apologetics.
   (4) Christian Ethics.
   (5) Christian Psychology.[6]
4. *Practical Theology.*

7. To Natural Theism.

This science treats of the existence and character of God in the light of nature and reason. Christian Ethics goes back to God as the ultimate ground and source of morality, and, besides citing the Holy Scriptures as authoritative, often appeals to the arguments of Natural Theism in support of the Biblical teaching. What is known in Theism as the Moral Argument for the divine existence interlaces with the fundamental principles of Christian morality.[7]

8. To Sociology.

This is a very important practical science, which has also its profound elemental principles, and therefore has a philosophical foundation. What is its relation to Ethics? In all sociological problems the question of right and wrong should always be a fundamental one. Sociology, which deals with men in their relations with one another, should not become merely utilitarian, economic and materialistic;

6. By the action of the Faculty of Hamma Divinity School this discipline was added, some years ago, to the department of Systematic Theology. It seems, therefore, to be appropriate to include it in the above outline.

7. Readers who may wish to investigate the several arguments for the divine existence are here referred to the following works: Flint, *Theism, Anti-Theistic Theories;* Valentine, *Natural Theology;* Micou, *Basic Ideas in Religion;* Snowden, *The Personality of God;* Keyser, *A System of Natural Theism.*

it should see to it that all social relations are based on the principles of righteousness. Therefore, Ethics and Sociology are closely bound together, and should walk hand in hand. One study complements the other. Sociology will broaden and deepen the ethical insight and interest, and will endeavor to make out a program of social welfare; while Ethics will keep social science loyal to the principles of righteousness, and will never allow it to wallow in the mire of mere expediency and utilitarianism.

9. To General Ethics.

In a Christian land Natural Ethics cannot avoid contact with Christian teaching, which sheds a radiant light upon all the ethical problems. Indeed, it would be unethical, as well as unscientific, for General Ethics to ignore the most outstanding and potent ethical phenomenon in the world, namely, Christianity. Thus, while the general ethicist may try to work only in the light of nature and reason, he is unconsciously influenced by the Christian revelation which shines all around him. It cannot be denied that the best and clearest systems of Natural Ethics have been wrought out in times and countries that have been illumined by Biblical teaching.[8]

Christian Ethics is *broader* than Natural Ethics, because the former accepts all the light and data that may be derived from nature and reason, and then adds to it the clearer light that comes from divine revelation. The God of the Bible, according to its own teaching, is also the God who created the physical cosmos, made man to fit into it, and still continues to preserve and care for it.

8. For works on general morality that recognize the Bible as the record of special divine revelations, cf. Valentine, *Theoretical Ethics;* Keyser, *A System of General Ethics.*

10. Relation to Religion.

There are religions which do not necessarily include the ethical element, or at least a very cogent ethical element. This is the case when the religion consists chiefly of ceremonial performances. Thus a man may be a very strict religionist, and yet may not be an upright moral man.

However, such is not the case in Biblical teaching. Morality belongs to the very essence of the Christian religion. To call a man an immoral Christian is to use contradictory terms, as much as it would be to say that a man is a *good bad* man or a *bad good* man. In Christianity men are saved from sin unto righteousness (Matt. 1:21; Acts 5:31; Rom. 1: 17; 6: 1-23; 8: 3, 4; 14: 17; 2 Cor. 6:14; 1 Tim. 6: 11). "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation" (Rom. 10: 10). The whole plan of redemption through Christ is surcharged with the ethical element: there is no salvation in Christianity except salvation from sin unto holiness of life.

The Christian religion might be compared to a fabric woven of two chief fibers – spirituality and morality. By spirituality is meant man's relation to and communion with God who is a Spirit; therefore man must have the spiritual mind (John 3: 5, 6; Rom. 8: 6; 1 Cor. 2: 14). By morality is meant that this spiritual religion must be pervaded with truth, honesty, purity. It is all summed up in one of our Lord's crucial teachings: "God is a Spirit; and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth" (John 4: 24). To "worship Him in spirit" means to be spiritually minded; to "worship in truth" means to be thoroughly sincere and honest – that is, ethical.

DIVISION II

The Ethical Source

(The Source of Right)

CHAPTER III

I. DEFINITION.

By this thesis we mean to answer these vital questions: What is the eternal dwelling-place of the Right? What is the ultimate Source of Moral Good? Why is one thing right and another wrong? What is the *raison d'etre of* moral distinctions?[1]

II. THE CHRISTIAN VIEW.

1. Statement.

The Ultimate Source of Right is God, the eternal, personal, self-existent, and perfect Creator, Preserver and Redeemer of the world.[2]

1. We cannot agree with Dr. Hyslop (*The Elements of Ethics*, p. 21) that all inquiries into the ultimate reality and nature of the ethical is to be relegated to Metaphysics. An ethical system that does not seek for a philosophical foundation surely cannot rightly be said to be adequate. Dr. Hyslop is inconsistent with himself, for he says in one place that such problems as the freedom of the will, etc., "must be deferred to Metaphysics;" yet he devotes 73 pages to a discussion of the freedom of the will! Important as this thesis is, it is still more important to find the ultimate basis of right and wrong.

2. Valentine, *ut supra*, pp. 138-181. Says John Fiske, in his *Cosmic Philosophy* (Vol. II, p. 470): The Deity is "knowable as the eternal source of the Moral Law, which is implicated with each action of our lives."

2. The Biblical Teaching.

(1) On this problem the Bible teaching is as abundant as it is explicit. God is the Creator of the cosmos (Gen. 1: 1) and of man (Gen. 1: 26, 27); hence He must be the Eternal Source of the Good.

(2) At the close of each epoch of the creative week God pronounced what He had made *good* (*tov;* Gen. 1: 10, 12, 18, 21, 25); having finished His creative work by the making of man in His own image, He called His collective work *very good* (*tov meod;* Gen. 1:31), which means *supremely* good. The Hebrew adjective *tov* often refers to God in the Bible, and also connotes moral good in many *loci.* Therefore, since God made all things good, He must be the Ground and Source of all good, moral as well as physical.

(3) The prohibition in the garden of Eden, when God forbade eating of "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil," would imply that God is the source of the good, but not of the evil; else He would have had no right to make such an inhibition nor to punish Adam and Eve for their disobedience.

(4) The Trisagion, "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts" (Isa. 6:3), and the many places where God is called "most holy," "the Holy One," "the Holy One of Israel," all would indicate that God, the Creator, is separate from sinners and the one "altogether excellent."

(5) "Righteousness and justice are the foundation of His throne" (Ps. 97: 2) points to the truth that God is the source of all moral qualities.

(6) Our Lord attributes all good to God: "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father who is in heaven give good things to them that ask Him" (Matt. 7: 11)?

(7) St. James teaches the same truth: "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, coming down from the Father of lights" (Jas. 1: 17).

(8) The same doctrine is taught in this passage: "Let no man say, when he is tempted, I am tempted of God; for God cannot be tempted with evil, and He tempteth no man" (Jas. 1: 13).

(9) By means of a Bible concordance one might note the many passages that ascribe "excellency" to God (Ex. 15: 7; Ps. 8: 1). Indeed, He is possessed of all the moral attributes, and is the foundation of them all.

3. The Biblical Teaching Vindicated by Reason.

(1) That there is a moral law that puts an imperative upon the human conscience few people would deny. A feeling, an intuition, of such a commanding law is practically universal in the human race. But a moral law connotes a lawgiver; and that leads back to a personal God as the Source of Right.

(2) To stop too soon in our search for the source of the right and good is superficial. We *can* think back to a personal and absolute Being, God, but then we have reached the *ultima thule*. We should have the depth needed to go back as far as thought can go.

(3) And why is God the ultimate Being? Because it is idle to raise the question, "Who made God?" because it involves a contradiction; for if some other being made God, he would not be God; and thus we would be led to an unending series of beings depending on nothing — a proposition that thought cannot endure.

(4) Morality can be predicated only of rational personalities. We cannot call mere things or animals moral. Nor

do we ascribe morality to lunatics and other demented people. Since, therefore, morality can be ascribed only to rational personal beings, the Ultimate Source of morality must be a Personal Being – God.

(5) The right must be eternal; for if there ever was a time when right was not, it never could have come into existence. But the right implies a rational personality in whom it inheres and by whom it is enacted – a kind of reasoning that leads back to God as the Ultimate Source of the Right.

(6) The universe, being rational, demands a rational cause. The non-rational or the irrational could not develop into the rational merely by resident forces. But a rational First Cause must be a Person; at least, we know of no kind of beings who can exercise rationality except persons. The right and the good are a part of the rationality of the cosmos; therefore they must have their ground and source in God.

(7) The Right is grounded in both the *nature* and the *will* of God. God must be good in His very being, or He could not be good at all. At the same time, He must be free, or He would not be a moral being. Yet, if there ever was a time when He was not free, He never could have become free. Whatever God is now, He must have been from eternity. Only that which is finite and had a beginning is capable of development. That which is eternal must be absolute, and therefore always the same. Thus in God's eternal being there is the perfect correlation of the *ethically necessary* and the *ethically free.*

For these reasons we must not posit the Right in God's *nature* alone, nor in His *will* alone, but in both. He is eternally good by nature, and yet He is eternally good by choice.

Otherwise good and evil would be due only to the arbitrary election of the Eternal Being, and that is not rational. If we cannot hold this conception clearly in mind, we might as well abandon the effort to solve the problem of the Ultimate Source of the morally good.

In this conception lies the reason for moral distinctions. Why is one thing right and another wrong? The answer is: A thing is right when it is in accord with the *holy nature and will of God;* a thing is wrong when it is opposed to His holy nature and will.

Thus, by a process of reasoning, we learn that a moral universe, such as the one in which we live and move and have our being, demands a theistic origin and foundation, and this conclusion agrees with the teaching of the Holy Scriptures.

4. The Highest Good (*Ta Agathon; Summum Bonum*).

In view of the foregoing discussion, one of the fundamental problems of Ethics, namely, *What is the Highest Good?* seems to be comparatively easy of solution. If God is the source of the good, then *He Himself as the Absolute Being* must be the *Highest Good* in the supreme sense. And since God created man in His own image, *likeness to his Maker* must be the *Highest Good for man.* With this view the Bible coincides: "Ye shall be holy, for I am holy" (Lev. 19: 2; 1 Pet. 1: 16); "Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your father in heaven is perfect" (Matt. 5: 48). Of course, for Christian Ethics this means that we should become like Christ (Eph. 4:13), who is the express image of the Father (Heb. 1:13), and who became "God manifest in the flesh" in order that He might be able to set us a concrete example of righteous living.

To the writer's mind, this view of the *Summum Bonum*

is simple and concrete. To learn what are the holy attributes of God, we must study His character in His Word and in the life and teaching of Jesus Christ. Thus the Highest Good in Christian Ethics is not something hazy and indeterminate, but is clear and concrete.

Bishop Martensen[3] and Bishop D'Arcy[4] define the Highest Good as the Kingdom of God or the Kingdom of heaven; and perhaps by means of a rather circular method of reasoning they are able to make their meaning fairly clear; but we believe that likeness to God is more simple and concrete; and surely if each individual would strive to incarnate the divine image in his character and life, the result would be the establishment of the kingdom of God in the world.

III. HUMANISTIC THEORIES.

The problem of the Highest Good has been one of the outstanding problems of Ethics ever since men began to think on the question of morality. Various answers have been given throughout the world's history, the chief of which it will, we think, be profitable to examine briefly.[5]

3. *Christian Ethics.*

4. *Christian Ethics and Modern Thought.*

5. A scholarly survey and exposition of the various ethical theories, from the Sophists to the Modern Schools, is found in De Laguna's *Introduction to the Science of Ethics,* Part II. Although we have not found it convenient to follow his classification, we call the reader's attention to his valuable work. He classifies the Greek schools as follows: Hedonism, Energism and Rigorism. The theories of the first school are sufficiently explained in the text. To our mind, De Laguna does not make the distinction between the other two schools very clear. They might, we think, be differentiated in this way: The Energists, as their name would imply, put the stress on moral endeavor, true self-realization and the attainment of the Highest Good, without despising pleasure as a legitimate result. Plato, Aristotle and their followers were Energists. The Rigorists laid more emphasis on sternness, austerity and self-denial in order

1. The Sophists.

With these early Greek speculatists, who flourished during the fifth century B. C., the primary question was, "What is the *permanent element* in Morality?" Hippias held that it was "the underlying principle of justice;" Thrasymachus, "the interest of the strongest" – a kind of "struggle-for-existence" theory.

These conclusions were not very definite. Compare them with the Christian view – that the *Summum Bonum* is likeness to God in moral character.

2. Socrates.

This great philosopher conceived that *knowledge* is the Highest Good. Give people the right kind of knowledge, and they will be righteous.

While this view is more definite than that of the Sophists, it still is inadequate; for people need more than mere knowledge to cure them of evil and cause them to walk in the way of uprightness. "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them"– showing that there may be a schism between knowledge and righteousness. The Christian view is much more profound.

3. Plato.

This philosopher approached more nearly to the Christian view than any others of the various Greek schools.[6] To *realize the divine ideas expressed in the cosmos* is the Highest Good for man, said Plato. This means the theistic

---

to achieve virtue, and would not permit the desire for pleasure to color their motives in the least. Thus their views tended toward asceticism. They were the Greek Puritans. The Cynics and Stoics were the Rigorists. Antisthenes and Diogenes were Cynics, and Zeno was the founder of Stoicism.

6. Plato was the founder of "The Academy," which was the name of a grove near Athens in which he held his conferences.

view, and seems properly to ground morality. Yet Plato failed to press and stress this basic doctrine as is done in Christian Ethics. His fourfold classification of the virtues, namely, *wisdom, courage, self-control* and *justice,* fails to include some of the noblest Christian graces, without giving too elastic a meaning to the terms. They would not include faith, hope and love. In Plato's *Ideal Republic* the State was made sovereign, and the principles were far too aristocratic.

4. Aristotle.

The source and norm of moral ideas lies in *the rational spirit of man.*[7] But here the question would arise, What is the source of man's rational nature? After all, this great philosopher did not go back to the Ultimate Source of Right, as Christian Ethics demands. His advocacy of the *via media* (the medium way), implying the avoidance of extremes and eccentricities, however, is valuable in the practice of moral principles.

5. Hedonism.

Hedonism (from *hedus,* sweet, pleasant) might be called the *pleasure theory of life.* The Highest Good is the securing of pleasure and the avoidance of pain. This term has come to include the Epicureans, who also sought pleasure as *Ta Agathon.* Its chief advocates were Aristippus and Epicurus. There were Hedonists of the coarser and those of the more refined order.

7. Aristotle was a member of "The Academy" until some time after Plato's death, when he partially severed his connection with that school and founded a rival school known as "The Lyceum." He is also known as the founder of the "Peripatetic" school, the word meaning "walking about." The Aristotelian Ethics may be classified as follows: 1. Nichomachean Ethics, compiled by the philosopher's son; 2. Eudemian Ethics, compiled by his pupil, Eudemus; 3. "Magna Moralis," perhaps compiled from both the preceding.

However, in all cases the theory is fundamentally wrong, for in true Ethics the first question always should be, "Is it right?" not, "Will it bring pleasure?" That is, the right and the pleasure-giving should not be identified; for it often happens that pleasure must be denied and sacrificed in order to walk uprightly. Ultimately joy will no doubt be the consequence of the truly ethical life; but even in that case the joy is the result or the product of moral being and endeavor, not the reverse.

6. Stoicism.

In Stoicism the Greeks and Romans attained to their highest ethical ideals.[8] Its chief advocates were Antisthenes, Zeno, Seneca, Cicero, Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius. Their maxim was, *Virtue for virtue's sake.*

While it was an idealistic view, it was stated abstractly, and would require the definition of virtue. Moreover, it went to the opposite extreme from Hedonism, and affected to despise all pleasure. Thus it led to rigorism, asceticism and stoical endurance. In contrast, Christian morality, while it holds to the doctrine that "virtue is its own excuse for being," yet does not contemn the right kind of joy when it is the product of the true life. Nor does it think that the desire for pure joy contaminates the motives in the pursuit of the truly ethical life. Christian morality does not make a virtue of being miserable merely for the sake of being so. When true righteousness and pleasure go hand in hand, the Christian rejoices in the fact and thanks God for the harmonious combination.[9]

8. The Cynics (not mentioned in the text, but in footnote 5 above) might be called an extreme wing of the Stoical school. They became scornful. The word Cynic (from the Greek *kunos*, a dog) refers to a surly, snarling habit.

9. For an admirable critique on Greek and Roman ethics, see Harris E. Kirk, *The Religion of Power*, pp. 81-143.

7. Divine Absolutism.

This theory grounds the right solely in the *will* of God. It was the view of the Scotists in the Middle Ages. The Mohammedan view is practically the same. The better view, as has been shown in a previous section of this work, is that the right is grounded in both the holy *nature* and *will* of God. Thus the right is not dependent on the arbitrary choice of God, but is eternal, just as is the being of God Himself.

8. Civil Authority.

In this view the State is the ultimate authority. It has its roots in Plato's *Republic.* It was advocated by Thomas Hobbes in his *Leviathan.*

The Christian view is more adequate. It teaches that men should "render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's," and that they should "be subject to the powers that be;" yet it does not hold that any human beings, even though they may be civil rulers, have such absolute authority that they must in every instance be obeyed. As a rule they should be, but there are exceptional circumstances in which men "ought to obey God rather than man."

9. Altruism.

This means "otherism" (from *alter,* other). In its extreme form, it would be impossible, utopian, for no man can forget himself utterly in his service for others. In this form it is, therefore, not practical.

However, when put in opposition to selfishness and egotism, Altruism is correct, and that is the sense in which it is generally used. The Bible inculcates the well-balanced principle: "Love thy neighbor as thyself;" "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you." Here the proper

balance between self-love and other-love is upheld, proving the teaching of the Bible to be sound and sane.

10. Utilitarianism.

As the term indicates, Utilitarianism in Ethics is the theory that the Highest Good is simply and solely *the useful, the beneficial;* therefore there is no absolute law of right *per se,* nor is the right to be cherished and practiced for its own sake. Sometimes this is called "the goods theory," because it looks only for the advantages in any course of conduct. In modern phrase, it is Pragmatism in Ethics. The criticisms of this theory are the following:

a. It is superficial; it does not seek for the Ultimate Source of the Good, but is apparently indifferent to it. It is non-theistic.

b. It does not accord with the testimony of conscience, which feels the sense of obligation to duty and righteousness.

c. It reverses the relative order of the right and the useful. Ultimately, according to the Christian faith and hope, the right and the useful will be in perfect agreement; but even then the proper distinction will be made in this way: A thing is useful because it is right, not, A thing is right because it is useful.

d. If the right and the useful are to be identified, why do men almost universally agree in calling some things *right* and others *wrong,* thus inserting the ethical conception? Such words as "right" and "wrong" are unnecessary in that case, and are merely an encumbrance to life and thought. We have plenty of terms to designate the useful and the beneficial; but the general consciousness and conscience of mankind require a number of ethical terms to differentiate moral ideas from all other conceptions.

e. The utilitarian theory is subversive of disinterested motives. Instead of leading men to ask first of all, Is it right? it leads them to insert the selfish thought, Will it be profitable to me?

11. Opportunism.

In its good sense this term means the ability to seize the opportunity. In the bad sense – the one in which it is generally used – it means the disposition to seize every chance for self-advancement. Hence Opportunism is at heart Hedonistic and Utilitarian. It means taking advantage of time and circumstance to further one's own interests. It is therefore subversive of true ethics. It is a term often used in the conduct of public affairs—in the political sphere.

12. Naturalistic Evolution.

Of course, this theory is atheistic. It holds that the material cosmos is eternal, and that its present status is the result of mere development by the operation of purely natural forces and according to natural laws. In connection with Agnosticism, it has given rise to a utilitarian scheme of morality, its best known exponent having been Herbert Spencer, who developed his views in his well-known work, *The Data of Ethics.*

Its cardinal principle is this : In the evolution of the human race, some kinds of conduct were found to be beneficial to the social organism, perhaps the primitive tribe, and these in course of time came to be called *right;* while other kinds of conduct were found to be harmful, and they have come to be called *wrong.* Thus the terms *right* and *wrong* are identified with the *useful* and the *harmful.* Nothing is either right or wrong *per se.*

In reply, it must be said that this is a very superficial treatment of ethical data and experiences :

a. Why should the terms, *right* and *wrong,* have been introduced into human language, if they do not stand for special concepts? Then they are tautological; they are simply an encumbrance to thought.

b. The theory goes back to material and impersonal substance for its ethical foundation, and that is absurd, for mere substance cannot possess ethical quality. As has already been shown in this work, the moral can be attributed only to rational personalities. Hence the Ultimate Ground of the Good must be a Person – God.

c. It is inconsistent with both philosophy and science to suppose that the non-moral could evolve, by means of resident forces, into the moral, because that would be getting something out of nothing. *Ex nihilo nihil fit,* is as true today as it was among the ancients.

d. The theory of evolution has never been established scientifiically. Scientists cannot account for the origin of matter, force, life, sentiency, species, personality, self-consciousness, conscience and spiritual experience. No case of spontaneous generation has ever been brought forward, but the law of biogenesis holds the field today among the biologists who stick to the facts. The same is true of the transmutation of one species into another and of animals into human and rational beings.

13. Theistic Evolution.

This view is held in *two forms:*

First, in the beginning God created the pristine material; in doing this, He endowed material substance with all the potencies needed for its subsequent development, including the personal, ethical and spiritual outcome; then He left the universe to be controlled and unfolded by secondary causes, namely, the "laws of nature." This is practically

the old view of Deism, transferred to the theory of modern evolution.

Second, God created the primordial material in its simple or homogeneous form; then, instead of deserting it, He remained immanent in it; since the original creation, His mode of operating in the cosmos has been through the laws of progressive evolution. Therefore, according to this view, evolution is simply the divine *modus operandi*, and God is practically identified with natural laws, forces and processes.

The theory of Deism first named above is open to most serious objection from the ethical viewpoint. It virtually pushes God out of His universe, and gives it up to secondary causes; thus it leaves so little room for freedom that the moral factor diminishes to the minimum, if it does not vanish entirely. A God who retires from His creation, abdicates His throne in favor of mere laws, and takes a long vacation, while His people are carrying on an unequal struggle in the world with the forces of evil, surely is not a God who would be likely to inspire moral effort and enthusiasm in the minds of His far-off, neglected foster children. No human father would thus forsake his offspring. How much better is the Christian view!

Regarding the second theory, that of theistic evolution, if it should ultimately be proven to be true scientifically, it would not invalidate the ethical reality of the world; for the personal God, the Creator, would be its Source and Ground, and, being immanently active in the cosmos, would be the personal executor of the law of righteousness implanted therein and in the consciences of men.

The question, therefore, to be settled is simply this: Has it been scientifically established that pure evolution is God's method of working in the universe? To put it more con-

cretely, is there sufficient empirical evidence that life was evolved from material substance by resident physico-chemical forces and combinations without the introduction of anything new at any point in the process; that all the genera and species of the vegetable and animal kingdoms have been evolved from a single primordial germ or cell; that man has been evolved from the lower animals; that consciousness, sentiency, conscience and will have evolved in this way; that in all this process, running through cycles and milleniums, God has never added any new force or substance to the original act of creation?

Let it be remembered that if, at any point in the whole process, God brought into existence any *new force or entity*, that would be an *act of creation*, not a process of evolution.

The author has often felt that the term, "theistic evolution," is inaccurate, unscientific, and illogical. After all, does not scientific evolution mean a process of unfolding by means of purely *resident* or *immanent* forces? But if God carried on the process, He must have been constantly infusing *new* energy into it from without, or there could have been no progress. Would that have been evolution in the strictly scientific sense? We think not. It is a wrong use of the term.

Our thesis here, however, is especially concerned with the data of morality, and so we submit a few considerations. All theists agree that God first created the primordial material substance. However, it must have been mere impersonal substance, mere *stuff*, mere *thing*. Now, since morality can inhere only in rational personalities, could God have endowed mere impersonal *stuff* with a moral quality? We ourselves, limited as our rational powers are, never

think of attributing morality to slime, or mud, or a clod, or a stone, or even an animal. Should it be held that God, being all-powerful, *could* have endowed mere material substance with seminal moral qualities, our reply is: It would have been absurd and even puerile for Him to work in so crude a way.

A far more rational procedure would, we think, have been the following: God created the material universe, unfolded it according to His own wisdom, adding something new whenever an entity of a higher order was to be brought into being, and at last, when the world was ready for occupancy by human personalities, He *created them,* enduing them, *in that very act,* with those moral qualities which inhere in beings of so highly organized a type. Taking all the facts into consideration, we must leave the reader to decide whether this view is not the most reasonable.[10] It certainly is in accord with Christian teaching.

Thus we have reviewed the various systems of Ethics, both ancient and modern, and have, we think, reached the conclusion that the theistic world-view is the only one that affords a sufficient rational and scientific basis, ground and explanation of the ethical data of the cosmos.

---

10. The foregoing Humanistic Theories have been somewhat more fully treated in the author's *A System of General Ethics,* pp. 56-81. Perhaps the classical Christian works which compare Christian moral teaching with the ethical principles of the ethnic religions and the various philosophical systems are Wuttke, *Christian Ethics,* Vol. I, and Luthardt, *History of Christian Ethics.*

DIVISION III

The Ethical Law

(The Law of Right)

CHAPTER IV

I. CONNECTNG LINKS.

1. God Created a Cosmos.

In our last main division we dealt with the Ultimate Source of the Right and the Good, and found it to be the eternal personality of God. We must now inquire whether God was satisfied to be forever the sole Being, or whether He created a universe with rational beings in it, who could have moral and spiritual fellowship with Himself. At once we discover that He pursued the latter course; for the cosmos is *here;* we see it and touch it, and know ourselves as a part of it.

2. He Created it a Moral Economy.

Since God is a righteous Being, since, indeed, He must be the Source of Right, it is reasonable to believe that He would inscribe upon the created universe a moral law, would make it a moral economy, would not be satisfied to make it a mere mechanism. This is, of course, the *a priori* method of argument, but it surely is reasonable, while the mechanistic view has already been found to be inadequate and unsatisfactory.

Besides, when we come to view the world, we find many empirical proofs that it is a moral *regime;* that the ethical law is inscribed upon the creation. Let us note:

II. PROOFS OF A MORAL ORDER IN NATURE.

1. The Reign of Law.

That this is a world of law need not be argued in these scientific days. Surely, then, any kind of a uniform order must connote a lawgiver, and that would lead back to God. If the universe were a mere happen-so, it would not be a cosmos, but a chaos. But why was the creation placed under the regularity of law? No sufficient reason can be assigned than that such an economy would be the only kind in which rational and moral beings could live and function. And the outcome shows that moral beings are here.

2. Design in Nature.

That there is purpose in the natural realm ought to need little or no argument. In proof read any good work on Natural Theism. But design connotes intelligence, and intelligence connotes personality — a mode of reasoning that leads back to God. And why was purpose writ so large upon the cosmos? Because the coming ethical beings could live and function only in an economy of purpose and adaptation. The sequel proves that the world was made to be the dwelling-place of moral beings.

3. The Natural Realm a Moral Arena for Man.

Did the Ultimate Being create moral agents and place them in the cosmos? This question answers itself, for men are here in the world, living and functioning in an ethical way.

And simply because the cosmos is under law and is

adapted to fulfil a specific purpose, we see that it is constituted to be an arena for man's moral activity. This is as plain, we think, as that a stadium was made for athletic purposes. For example, the natural realm affords man many opportunities for making choices, and his power of choice fits into this *regime*. Not only can man exercise natural options, but he can and often must elect between good and evil, right and wrong; and in such exercise of his freedom nature affords him the stadium and opportunity.

Thus, from a process of reasoning, we conclude that the world, with its human inhabitants, is a moral economy, ruled by its Creator according to the law of right. It will now be our privilege to note the Biblical teaching regarding this thesis, and see how perfectly it accords with what reason teaches. It might be added at this point that our rational processes have been greatly aided and assured because, all the while, we have been working in the light of the divine revelation in the Bible. Certainly reason could not walk so firmly if it had nothing but the ethnic religions and the dim light of nature to guide it.

III. BIBLICAL TEACHING REGARDING THE MORAL LAW.

1. The Narrative of Creation.

At the close of each epoch (Genesis 1), God pronounced the work that He had done *good* (Hebrew, *tov*), and finally *very good* (*tov meod*). In this connection the term *good* must include moral good as well as physical, because man was created in the divine similitude. The Hebrew adjective *tov* connotes moral good in many contexts of the Bible.

2. The Forbidden Tree.

This tree was called "the tree of the knowledge of good

and evil." This designation indicates how early moral distinctions were made in the Holy Scriptures. The inhibition placed upon it also proves that the progenitors of the race were placed under moral law immediately after their creation. The world, therefore, is represented by the Bible in one of its earliest sections as a moral economy.

3. The Fall of Man.

The fact that as soon as man disobeyed the divine command he fell – that is, became conscious of his wrong-doing – proves that he had been placed under the moral law. The same fact is implied in the penalty visited upon him.

4. Providential Dealings in Biblical History.

Whenever nations did right in the sight of God, He bestowed upon them His favor, and commended their conduct. On the other hand, wrong-doing was always condemned and punished. Again these facts point to an objective moral law.

5. The Decalogue.

The Ten Commandments, given under most solemn and impressive conditions, set forth the law of God, in which the right is approved and the wrong condemned, with the proper sanctions attached.

6. The Sermon on the Mount.

This portion of the Word is usually regarded as a deepening and spiritualizing of the moral law announced on Sinai. It goes to the heart of the ethical principles in its dealing with man. "Blessed are the poor in spirit;" "Blessed are the pure in heart." The law of right is here given.

7. Numerous Precepts and Adages.

The Bible is replete with wise and wholesome moral maxims, all of which clearly recognize the law of righteous-

ness. Only a few of these need be given. "I will meditate in thy law day and night;" "O how I love thy law;" "I hate them that are of a double mind, but thy law do I love;" "Thy law have I hid in my heart that I might not sin against thee;" Paul said that "the law is good," even though men cannot be saved by it. The heathen have the law written upon their hearts.

8. The Plan of Redemption.

So holy and majestic is the moral law that God could not forgive men by a mere fiat, but sent His eternally begotten Son into the world, to be born of a woman, born under the law, that He might redeem them that are under the law, and thus make them sons of God. It was love and mercy, it is true, that moved the Father to send the Son and the Son to become incarnate; but it was the holy law of divine justice — a structural part of the universe as a moral economy — that required divine love to redeem sinful man by the expiation made by the incarnate Son of God, who is the source and foundation of the moral law. All of this indicates clearly how deeply the writers of the Bible were led by the Holy Spirit to recognize the *law of right in the world.*

We are now prepared to consider the moral agents whom God created and placed in the cosmos under the law of right.

IV. MORAL AGENTS UNDER THE LAW.

1. Definitions.

(1) *Of Moral Agency.*

Moral agency is the ability of a personal being to perceive the right and the wrong and to choose between them.

(2) *Of a Moral Agent.*

A moral agent is a person who is able to perceive the right and the wrong and to choose between them.

2. Angels as Moral Agents.

The doctrine of angels (Angelology) belongs to the discipline of Christian Dogmatics. In examining the teaching of the Scriptures, it seems to be plain that angels were the first rational beings created. They may have been "the sons of God who shouted for joy" in the morning of the creation. We read of angels who "kept not their first estate." Our concern here is with their ethical character and conduct.

(1) *Their Created Status.*

They evidently were perfect as to moral quality. The previous citation, "the angels who kept not their first estate," would plainly indicate that they were created with original righteousness. Nor were they mere automata. Had they been, some of them could not have fallen. They were moral agents, with their wills at perfect equilibrium between good and evil, so that they could choose one alternative or the other. Reason would teach that it was better for God to create free moral beings than mere happy machines or automata. For everything that is worth while some risk is incurred. In order to make creatures who could attain real moral excellence, which is the highest kind of excellence of which we can form any conception, God created free beings. This is the justification of God in making this adventure.

(2) *A Test Necessary.*

That a test is essential is implied in the very nature of moral agency. Without an adequate ordeal of some kind, it would have been futile to create moral agents. Indeed,

it is doubtful if such an act were possible, even for God, who would not work an absurdity. Therefore some kind of a trial must have come to the angels after their creation. What it was is not revealed, but perhaps it was pride, ambition, envy – perhaps jealousy of God and His sovereign rule. This spirit led to rebellion, and thus Satan and his followers were cast out of heaven.

On the other hand, the moral status of the good angels is this: Having successfully passed through the ordeal set before them, they, by their own choice, incorporated their created righteousness in their own characters, and thus established themselves in holiness forever, having attained the highest freedom, the power always to do the right with no outer compulsion. But the angels who rebelled introduced into their characters by their own volition the element of evil, so that they are in the bondage of sin, perhaps forever, as we read nowhere in the Holy Scriptures that redemption is possible for them.

3. Man as a Moral Agent.

(1) Created in the divine image, he must have been righteous in the beginning of his career. It is reasonable to believe that God would have made him so, for surely we cannot believe that He would have created a sinful creature. The Bible represents man as innocent in his first estate – perhaps it would be more positive to say that he was created in a state of *moral integrity*. Morally there was nothing defective about him.

It was but fair, too, that, if man was to be created, he should be made without moral fault or weakness, or an evil strain, and then placed in the midst of a favorable environment – represented in the Bible as the garden of Eden with all its beauty and fruitfulness. Surely that is a nobler

conception than the doctrine that he was developed in a jungle and was engaged for many millennia in a bloody struggle for existence. Would that have been a moral *regime* – a bloody pathway in which the strongest and subtlest survived. If progress came by that process throughout the cycles of the past, why should not the same gory route lead to progress now? Could a fierce and selfish struggle for existence ever have evolved into its precise opposite, the rule and fellowship of altruistic love? Can something evolve out of nothing? Can a higher quality evolve out of a lower?

(2) *The Power of Choice.*

Again we are brought face to face with the problem of moral agency. From the very language used in the Biblical description of our first parents' original condition, it is plain that they were created with the power of choice. They were bidden to eat of all the trees of the garden except one – the tree of forbidden fruit. If they had no volitional power, such an inhibition would have been puerile. So it is clear that man was not created a mere automaton; that he was endued with that high prerogative known as liberty, the power of choice. The problem of freedom will be dealt with later on.

(3) *The moral test in Eden.*

As was said in the discussion concerning the angels, man, if he was to discipline and establish his moral character, must have had an adequate test. Since he was a physical being, the test took on a physical form, "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil," and thus his temptation came to him as an integral being, appealing to both his mind and his body. This seems to be most reasonable; it lies in the very structure of things as we know them.

PROPERTY OF THE
LOS ANGELES BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINA

(4) *God's subsequent treatment of the pair.*

It is evident that our first parents were moral agents, or it would have been unjust to punish them for their disobedience. Yet God cast them out of the garden, and cursed the ground on account of their sin, and compelled them afterward to live by the sweat of their face. The very extent of the penalty assigned them indicates that sin is no light matter; also that the pair were under no compulsion to sin, but were free beings.

4. Constituents of Moral Agency.

(1) *Rational Intelligence.*

By this term is meant the normal functioning of the various powers of the mind. Only to beings thus constituted can morality be attributed. We do not call inorganic substance moral, neither do we apply that term to plants and animals or to demented people. Only when people are sufficiently rational to know the difference between right and wrong do we hold them responsible for their conduct and regard them as moral beings.

(2) *Conscience.*

Conscience is that faculty of the human mind which perceives and senses the right and wrong and their fundamental antagonism.

Other terms are used to designate this faculty, namely, the Moral Consciousness, the Moral Faculty, the Moral Sense, the Moral Intuition.

As to its etymology, it is derived from the Latin, *con*, with, and *scio*, to know; therefore to *know with*. Its derivation, however, scarcely gives a clue to its technical meaning. The term "Consciousness" is derived from the same stem; but it means awareness. By general agreement, how-

ever, the term "Conscience" has come to mean the moral faculty of the soul.

It is a Scriptural term, occurring quite frequently in the New Testament. The Greek term for Conscience is *suneidesis*, "a knowing with oneself." Its usage in the New Testament indicates that it is recognized as the faculty for moral distinctions and values: "Being convicted by their own conscience" (John 8: 9); "I have lived in all good conscience" (Acts 23:1); "Their conscience also bearing witness" (Rom. 2:15); "Their conscience, being weak, is defiled" (1 Cor. 8: 7). The effect of sin upon the conscience is clearly recognized: "Having their conscience seared as with a hot iron" (1 Tim. 4: 2).

The fact that no specific term for the conscience is used in the Old Testament is no proof that the faculty was not recognized; for wherever man is commanded to do right and avoid the wrong and wherever moral distinctions are made, the implication is clear that such a faculty exists in man, or it could not have been appealed to.

As to the *origin* of Conscience, both Christian Theology and Christian Ethics, based upon the Bible, teach that it is an *innate* faculty; an essential part, at least in potential form, of man's mental structure as he came from the creative hand of God (Gen. 1: 26, 27). Reason confirms this doctrine; for if there ever was a time when man was absolutely non-moral, a moral faculty never could have been evolved; it must have been created by a supreme moral Being – God. The non-moral never could evolve, by means of resident forces, into the moral. Nothing can come from nothing. Conscience is not, therefore, an acquired functioning power, as many people hold today.

That Conscience is a *distinct* faculty of the soul ought

to require little argument. None of the other mental powers have the same content and significance. When you ask the questions, "Is it right?" "Is it wrong?" an appeal is made to a very specialized faculty of the mind; and there is no other faculty except the Conscience to react properly to these interrogations. Moreover, morality is of such outstanding importance to human well-being that it would indeed be strange if the mind had no specialized faculty for moral facts and situations.

As to the *psychology* of the Conscience, it will be seen, by studying the "Outline of the Human Mind" in Chapter II of this work, that it is found in two places. First, it is a *perception* – that is, it belongs to the intellectual power of the mind. We often say, "I perceive with my Conscience, or my Conscience perceives, that such and such a state or act is right or wrong, as the case may be." In this place we call the Conscience the "Cognition of Right and Wrong;" therefore a cognitive faculty.

The Conscience also belongs to the *emotional* activities of the mind. We say rightly, "I feel in my Conscience that such an act is right." Since the term is used currently in this dual sense, there is no reason why scientific Ethics should not recognize this common understanding.

In the interest of scientific analysis we give here a table showing a classification of the ethical emotions:

1. Classes:
   (1) Moral love: delight in and approval of the right.
   (2) Moral aversion: hatred of the wrong.
   (3) Before an action: feeling of obligation or duty.
   (4) After an action:
      a. If right: approval, satisfaction, ethical joy.
      b. If wrong: disapproval, shame, guilt, remorse.

2. Degrees of Intensity:
   (1) Vary with heredity and temperament.
   (2) Vary with environment and education.
   (3) Vary with ethical effort or neglect.

3. Feeling as a Motive Power:
   (1) It furnishes an incentive for right and wrong doing; mere cold perception would have no moving force.

   (2) Classes of right motives:
      a. Desire for the true benefits of righteousness.
      b. Love of the right for its own sake.
      c. Love of God as the true source of the good.

Something needs to be said about the *supremacy* of the Conscience. In all *moral* situations it should be supreme, for it is the only power of the mind that has been endued by the Creator with the distinctive insight to react to the right and the wrong. Just as the eye is regnant in the realm of vision, the ear in the realm of hearing, the reasoning faculty in the sphere of logic, so the Conscience must decide in the moral field. However, it should be remembered that the authority of Conscience is only *advisory, not coercive.*

Although the Conscience should be supreme in the moral sphere, that does not mean that it is infallible. Just as the other faculties are limited and liable to err, even in their own special fields, so Conscience has its limitations. For this reason it should be enlightened and disciplined as much as possible, just as must all the other faculties. It would be strange if the other powers of the human mind were fallible and the Conscience alone infallible. If Conscience were thus endued, there would be no need of a special revelation from God, such as we have in the Bible.

What is the relation of the Conscience to the other faculties of the soul? First, it is dependent only on them for its ability to function: upon rational intelligence to enable it to act intelligently; upon consciousness to give it a field of action; upon the will to carry out its decisions. Second, the other powers are dependent on the Conscience to enable them to function ethically; otherwise no distinction could be made between right and wrong conduct and states. Indeed, a right view of psychology holds that all the mental powers are integrally related and mutually dependent. One faculty cannot say to another, "I have no need of you."

CHAPTER V

IV. MORAL AGENTS (continued).

4. Constituents of Moral Agency (continued).

(3) *The Will.*

The Will is the *self-determining power of the mind.* Other definitions are: the capacity of the mind to choose and execute; the autonomy of the Ego or Self.

Everywhere in the Bible this capacity is recognized either explicitly or implicitly. Man is nowhere treated as if he were a mere automaton, run by machinery or placed in an ironclad *regime* of necessity. Everything that has been said on previous pages about his having been created a moral agent will apply to this thesis. When our first parents were commanded to eat of the fruit of the garden and were forbidden to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, the situation connotes, *ipso facto,* that man was endued with the power of choice. Every command, every exhortation, every appeal in the Bible, implies freedom of the will. "Look unto me, all ye ends of the earth, and be ye saved," would be an absurd exhortation if man were in the grip of determinism. Christ said to the hardened Pharisees and Scribes, "Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life." This spells conative ability. Thus the Bible is against the crude theory of determinism.

The Will has certain *unique powers:* a. The power of attention; b. The power of originating motion and action;

c. The power of alternate choice; d. The power of execution. No entity, as far as we know, is in possession of these peculiar powers save a rational mind with the enduement of freedom.

Freedom is a *sine qua non* of moral agency. This ought to be plain to every thinker. If the Ego has no power of choice, it is in the grip of necessity, and hence cannot be ethical in any true sense of the term. Then Conscience would be like a nominal sovereign, sitting upon a throne with no power to execute its behests and decisions.

At this point a few terms should be defined. The hypothesis that denies the freedom of the Will is called *Determinism* or *Necessitarianism*. The view that the Will is free within its divinely prescribed limits is known as *Libertarianism*. Sometimes the term *Indeterminism* is employed to designate the conception that the Will is in nowise determined or influenced by environment, heredity and other conditions. This last term indicates an extreme position on the side of liberty, just as Determinism is an extreme on the side of the bondage of the Will.[1]

The Christian system has a special contribution to make regarding this important thesis, the freedom of the Will. In matters of civil or conventional morality (called "civil righteousness"), it upholds the Will's freedom. It never teaches that man is merely the catspaw of circumstances.

1. Herbert Spencer was an exponent of Determinism. We quote from his *Principles of Psychology*, Vol. I, p. 503: "Psychical changes either conform to law or they do not. If they do not conform to law, this work, in common with all works on the subject, is sheer nonsense; no science of psychology is possible. If they do conform to law, there cannot be any such thing as free will." Of course, when a man has no higher conceptions of law and causality than mere physical and mechanical force, he cannot grasp the idea of freedom, whose laws belong to a higher realm, that of the psychical and ethical.

He is capable, in this sphere, of doing many things that are either right or wrong.

However, in the *spiritual* realm the Bible teaches that man's Will is in bondage since the Fall of Adam; that it "can in nowise set itself free;" that no man can save himself; that, indeed, in spiritual matters man "is dead in trespasses and sins" (Eph. 2:1). Therefore he needs to be "quickened," aroused, delivered from his bondage, before his will is able to function in the true spiritual sense. Under the subject of sin more will be said on this theme. In the following discussion we are speaking of civil freedom and civil righteousness, or what may be called "conventional morality."

Among the proofs of the freedom of the Will, the following may be mentioned:

a. The testimony of consciousness. In general men are just as vividly conscious of acts of self-determination as they are of any other acts that come within the field of knowledge. Why, then, deny the witness of the soul in this respect, the freedom of the Will?

b. The test of experiment. Test yourself and see how many things you can do and think by conscious efforts of the Will. Lift your arm to a horizontal position; now to a perpendicular position; now let it drop to your side. Now make yourself think of the sun, of the moon, of Saturn, of the Pleiades; now think of truth, virtue, God. At every step you are conscious of having made a distinct effort through your volitional powers, and you are not conscious of any coercion either from without or from within. People who deny the freedom of the Will must have feeble powers of introspection. Their consciousness must have become blurred.

c. The demands of man's environment. In order to live in the natural world every one of us must make innumerable choices. Human society and human government are largely based on the postulate of freedom.

d. The mind intuitively differentiates between free and forced acts. If a student were put out of the classroom by force, he would not tell you that he walked out "by his own free will and accord."

e. The Determinist himself cannot live in this world and be consistent with his theory. He acts as if he were free, and demands that other people act in the same way. He even criticizes others for rejecting his views. Let us not adopt a philosophy by which we cannot live

We cannot help feeling amused at Mr. Thilly's efforts to prove the deterministic view and disprove the libertarian view:[2] "The deterministic theory is not, however, a discouraging and paralyzing doctrine. On the contrary, the knowledge that we are determined must determine us to *avoid certain* conditions, and *seek others* more favorable." The very words "avoid" and "seek" connote the power of free choice, and prove that, as we have said, it is impossible for the Determinist to be logically consistent.

f. No one can estimate the harmful results of Determinism if it should once inoculate society; for then every crime could be excused on the ground that the perpetrator "couldn't help it."[3]

2. *Introduction to Ethics,* pp. 337, 338.

3. A professor in a well-known State University (tax-supported) recently advocated Determinism, declaring that it was the only "scientific" view. He even went so far as to assert that criminals were not responsible for their evil deeds. Do the people who support our public schools want their young people to be infected with such doctrine?

g. It is true that man's freedom is limited. He cannot do everything. If he could, he would be omnipotent like God. But this is no argument against the view that he has freedom within the divinely prescribed limits. Because a man does not know everything is no reason for saying that he knows nothing. Because a man is not omnipotent is no reason for calling him impotent.

h. The mystery of freedom of choice is no objection to the doctrine. Sense perception, as Huxley showed in his day, is an inexplicable mystery. So is emotion. It is not necessary to know the *how* of freedom, but only the *fact of freedom.*[4]

i. Even though, in the spiritual sense, the will is in bondage to sinful depravity, it has not been annihilated. It is still there *in nuce* and *in potentia;* therefore it can be quickened and disenthralled by the Holy Spirit operating through the law and the gospel. Thus there is hope of ethical restoration for every sinner, no matter how much he may be in bondage to sinful habit.[5]

(4) *Motives* or *Intentions.*

a. Definition.

A motive or intention is *the reason why* a moral agent

4. Note Tennyson's acute lines in *De Profundis:*
"This main miracle: That thou art thou,
With power on thine own act and on the world."

5. It would be well early in life to adopt this bracing motto:
"I'm the captain of my soul,
I'm the master of my fate."

Emerson has given us a bracing quatrain:
"For He that ruleth high and wise,
Nor pauseth in His plan,
Will tear the sun out of the skies,
Ere freedom out of man."

lives and acts as he does. It is the purpose of his life and conduct, the end he has in view.

b. Motives essential to moral agency.

Psychologically the motives belong to the reason and the emotions. They do not lie in the Will itself; they *impel* the Will. They are essential to moral agency, because the man who would live and act without any motives would hardly be a rational being; he would perhaps be a moron or a lunatic.

c. Varied relations of motives.

Respecting the Will, they *influence* but do *not coerce* it. To put it alliteratively, so that it will be remembered: motives *impel,* but do not *compel,* the Will. In relation to the actor, they determine his moral character, whether it is good or bad. In regard to action, they do not determine its moral character, for an act that is right in itself may be performed from an impure motive, and *vice versa.* We might say that the motive, if it is right, "makes the actor fine," but not necessarily the action.

In practical matters, therefore, we should deal with people in this way: If a person does a good act from a pure motive, we should commend both his act and his motive. If he does a good act from a wrong motive, we should approve his act, but condemn and correct his motive. If he does a wrong act from a good motive, we should correct the act, but commend the motive. If he does a wrong act from a wrong motive, we should disapprove of both act and motive.

d. Various kinds of motives.

Men are variously motivated. Some motives are evil, and only evil continually. They are selfish, sordid, impure, hypocritical.

Other motives may, in this complex world, be mixed — partly good and partly evil. Cases may be easily perceived in which a man's intentions are a complex of egotism and altruism. Perhaps there are few people in this sinful world who are actuated by absolutely pure motives. Even the best and most spiritually minded people must often lament the fact that self and selfish desire far too often discolor the motives of their thinking and conduct.

Yes, we must constantly pray for mercy and forgiveness, and cry to God to rinse our motives from impurity.

e. The highest motive.

In Christian Ethics it does not seem to be difficult to determine the highest motive that can impel our life and conduct. It is undoubtedly *grateful love to God* for all His mercies and benefits, especially in redeeming us from sin. "We love, because He first loved us;" "The love of Christ constraineth us;" "Herein is love; not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins." Paul speaks of "faith which worketh by love." This designates the same motive as when he exclaims, "For me to live is Christ." He also says: "And hope maketh not ashamed, because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost who is given unto us." May God lift us by His cleansing grace and power to that plane where all our service will be motivated by *grateful love* to Him!

CHAPTER VI

V. JUSTIFICATION OF BIBLICAL ETHICS.

1. Its Special Merits.

(1) *Revealed clearly yet progressively.*

Everywhere in the Bible the high ethical standard is upheld. Somehow, you feel at once, in reading the opening chapters of the Bible, that you are in the presence of an absolute law of right. The bars are nowhere let down. Already in the forbidden tree we see clear moral distinctions. In the treatment of Cain "sin croucheth at the door." The antediluvians were punished because "every imaginations of their heart" was evil. And so on through the Bible.

And yet the righteous will of God was revealed more and more explicitly as time moved on and as dispensations followed in succession. While the absolute standard was inculcated, yet the same standards of practice were not required of men in the childhood and youth of the race as were required when the fuller revelation came. Just as in the home the law of right is upheld, and yet small children are not put under the same *regime* as those who have reached the age of responsibility or maturity. As the race developed, the requirements of the law of God became more clearly revealed. Everywhere men are to be judged according to their light – "according to that which they have, and not according to that which they have not." The revelation became clearer throughout the Old Testament

dispensation until it culminated "in the fullness of time" in the coming of the Son of God, who revealed the perfect will of God. Whether we can explain the process or not, the perfect standard is everywhere maintained, and yet there is a gracious divine accomodation to the need and unfolding of the human family. These facts will help to explain many supposed difficulties in the ethics of the Old Testament.[1]

(2) *Correlation of precepts and principles.*

In the Old Testament there are, it is true, many precepts, rules and commandments. This method was necessary in the early history of the race, just as the same method is needed with children and young people in the home and the school. They must often be told in detail just what to do and not to do. Any parent or teacher knows this to be true.

And yet even in the Old Testament fundamental principles are laid down. They are in the commandments themselves, in the Psalms, the Proverbs and the prophecies. The general principle of righteousness is constantly enjoined, and many times without entering into details and laying down minute rules. "The Lord knoweth the way of the righteous" (Ps. 1:6); "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me" (Ps. 51:10); "Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord? or who shall stand in His holy place? He that hath clean hands and a pure heart" (Ps. 24: 3, 4).

1. On Biblical difficulties in general, see the following works: Haley, *Alleged Discrepancies of the Bible;* Tuck, *A Handbook of Biblical Difficulties;* Torrey, *Difficulties in the Bible;* Gray, *Bible Problems Explained;* Scofield, *Question Box;* Ingram, *Old Testament Difficulties; New Testament Difficulties; Popular Objections to Christianity.*

All these are fundamental principles of life. In this way slavery, even though temporarily permitted by the Mosaic legislation, was so regulated by principles of human justice and equality, that it was gradually elided from the Judaistic system.

In the New Testament there is no legalism Of course, some rules were necessary even then, and they are scattered through the gospels and epistles, because even under the dispensation of the gospel and of the Holy Spirit, they are needed; but much more do the broad foundational ethical principles prevail. The redeemed and regenerated Christian does not feel hampered and bound by minute and rigid regulations, but feels himself to be a free man indeed (Jn. 8: 32, 36). In this way, too, slavery, though not expressly forbidden, could not long prevail in Christian communities. The very equality and brotherhood created by the gospel of redeeming grace eliminated it.[2] Thus the Christian system is very different from the legalism of so many other religious systems. It does not leave the ethical sphere in a state of ambiguity, on the one hand, nor does it burden the conscience with minutiae and perfunctory service, on the other. It reveals and teaches a wonderful correlation of precept and principle.[3]

2. Some Modernistic Criticisms.

Nearly all these criticisms of Biblical ethics are resurgences of old infidel objections, and have been answered again and again by Christian Apologists. Nevertheless, they are being repeated today. The Biblical ethicist must

2. See D'Arcy, *Christian Ethics and Modern Thought*, pp. 27-35.

3. Other merits of the Christian system of morality are dealt with throughout this volume, showing everywhere its high ideals and standards.

deal with them frankly. However, our limits of space will permit only a few of them to be dealt with here.[4]

(1) *Polygamy in the Old Testament.*

The candid admission should be made that this is a real difficulty. Perhaps every Bible student has been puzzled about it. However, we should remember what has already been said, namely, that the ethical law of God was revealed progressively. Polygamy was never commanded in the Bible by God Himself. Indeed, the clear statement of Gen. 2: 23, 24 (referred to and interpreted by Christ in Matt. 19 and Mark 10) indicates that the divine plan in the beginning was monogamous marriage. Perhaps polygamy was permitted in the Old Testament (just as many other things were permitted), because God saw that it was best to work out gradually the correct principles rather than to set down the law specifically in every detail. It is also true that polygamy invariably wrought family trouble even among the patriarchs, and thus the race found out by experience that the lawful marriage of one man and one woman is the only right method. Surely Christ taught that monogamy was the divine plan.

(2) *Severity of punishment.*

Much fault has been found with the severity of the divine punishments in the Old Testament. From the days of Celsus, Porphyry, Lucian and Hierocles down to the present day, with infidels and liberalists these matters have been the chief stock in trade.

Our reply is: No people in Old Testament times were ever punished except for sin. Every nation that did right in the sight of God was blessed and prospered. Read the

4. Consult the books on Biblical difficulties cited in footnote 1 above.

full history of the destruction of the antediluvians in the Noachian deluge, of the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, of the Canaanites, and all the rest, and see whether the fatal cause was not, in every case, their unspeakable iniquity. Recently a Modernist found fault with the Biblical statement regarding the destruction of the Canaanites.[5] But what reason does the Bible give? Here it is: "For the wickedness of these nations the Lord doth drive them out before thee" (Deut. 9: 4, 5); "Defile not ye yourselves with any of these things: for in all these the nations are defiled which I cast out before you: and the land is defiled; therefore do I visit the iniquity thereof upon it, and the land itself vomiteth out her inhabitants" (Lev. 18: 24, 25).[6]

Even if the Bible were not true, it is evident that any people who descend to such low practices as did those ancient people will sooner or later bring on their own destruction by the very operation of nature's laws. Critics would far better heed these terrible warnings and cease finding fault with the Bible.

(3) *The borrowing by the Israelites.*

A recent Biblical critic,[7] who is also a teacher in a divinity school, or at least was a few years ago, has revamped this ancient infidel objection – that the children of Israel were instructed to "borrow" from their Egyptian neighbors with no intention of ever "bringing back what they bor-

5. Fosdick, *The Modern Use of the Bible*, p. 89. And yet this writer believes in evolution, and therefore that nature made her grand progress from amoeba to man by means of the gory struggle for existence! He evidently forgot to read the reason why God destroyed the wicked Canaanites, as given in the proof passages cited in the text.

6. See Torrey, *ut supra*, pp. 47-52.

7. Bade, *The Old Testament in the Light of To-day*, pp. 73, 124.

rowed." How much sympathy the critic seems to have with the Egyptians, and only criticisms of God's ancient people!

The answer has often been given. The Hebrew word for "borrow" simply means to "ask." So there was no *borrowing* at all; the Israelites *asked* for these gifts, and the Egyptians were disposed to be generous to their departing neighbors.[8]

(4) *The question of "Interim Ethics."*

Several years ago Dr. Albert Schweitzer[9] brought the charge that the New Testament inculcated merely an "Interim Ethics." This means that Christ and His apostles taught a wholly apocalyptic view of the plan of God; that the end of the world was near at hand; hence they did not teach the principles of a permanent morality, intended for the guidance of long years of mundane life, but only a temporary morality that would prepare Christ's followers for the impending crisis of His return to judge the people and destroy the world. It is the so-called "eschatological view" of Christianity.

There is, of course, some truth in the doctrine. It is true that men are to live in expectation of the coming of Christ at some time, and such an expectation is an incitement for them to live righteously. However, our Lord taught that no man knew when the end of the world would occur; He even hinted that it might be long delayed. Therefore, while He and His disciples clearly taught that men should always be prepared for His advent, they proceeded to teach a solid

8. See Murphy, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Exodus,* p. 33; Keil and Delitzch, *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament,* Vol. I, pp. 445, 446.

9. In his *The Quest of the Historical Jesus.*

ethic that would enable all men to plan and work in a well stabilized economy that would make it worth while for them to build up a permanent character and life. Men were not to be neglectful of the demands of the present life in order to prepare for the future.[10]

Thus both worldliness and other-worldliness are avoided by the Christian ethical teaching. "Godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come."

(5) *The negative and positive virtues.*

John Stuart Mill passed the criticism that Biblical Christianity taught the negative virtues, but failed to emphasize those of a strong and positive character – a kind of passive morality. Meekness, inoffensiveness, love and gentleness – these were inculcated, he said, but not the virile characteristics of courage, uprightness, patriotism, and an aggressive and forceful personality.[11]

But Mr. Mill, as is usual with the critics, read only a part of the New Testament. It is true that in the early part of the gospels, as, for example, the Sermon on the Mount, the virtues of humility, contrition, poverty of spirit and purity of heart are taught; and that was right. These are the humble conditions of entrance into Christ's kingdom, which will not admit human vanity, conceit and self-righteousness. But once entrance is gained into Christ's kingdom, there is plenty of room and opportunity for the cultivation of all the virile principles of life. No one can be a weakling and be a true Christian. Christ taught by precept and example that men should be brave in time of danger; should never

10. See D'Arcy, *ut supra,* pp. 14, 17, 25, 29.

11. The opposite view is stoutly upheld by Bishop D'Arcy, *ut supra,* pp. 13-16.

show the "white feather"; should be willing to die rather than to lie. The apostle said, "Provide things honest in the sight of all men;" "Be diligent in business;" "Prove all things; hold fast to that which is good;" "Be steadfast, unmoveable;" "Be strong in the Lord and in the power of His might;" "Put on the whole armor of God;" "Fight the good fight of faith."

The ethical teaching of the Bible has produced many heroes and heroines, who have braved every kind of danger, ridicule, abuse, persecution. Judged by its fruits, therefore, the Christian religion has ethical as well as spiritual elements that produce sterling, stalwart and heroic character.

Thus we believe that, by taking a broad historical view, by interpreting a spiritual book like the Bible in a spiritual way, and by laying aside the carping temper, the ethical teaching of the Bible throughout can be upheld and justified.

DIVISION IV

The Ethical Antithesis
(Sin)

CHAPTER VII

I. CONNECTING LINK.

In our ethical plan we have thus far considered, first, the Source of Right, second, the Law of Right in the creation. In the midst of our investigations something adverse has ever been implied and frequently mentioned. It has not been like a shadowy specter, but, rather, like a grim and terrible reality. We refer to the Antithesis of Right, namely, the *Wrong*, the Unethical, what we shall frankly call *Sin*. The very conception of the Right and of a moral economy, such as we have found the world to be, would connote at least the *possibility*, though not necessarily the *actuality*, of the Wrong. As the world is at present constituted, we cannot think of the Right without thinking of its opposite. Looking at the world of humanity as it really is, no one can deny that the Wrong has come into the world and has created sad moral turbulence and havoc.

If Christian Ethics – and this is also true of General Ethics – would aim to be thoroughgoing and scientific, it must treat of the Wrong as well as of the Right.

II. DEFINITION AND TERM.

1. Definition of Sin.

Sin is any principle, state or act that is contrary to the Law of Right, which is an expression of the holy nature and will of God.

2. The Term Sin.

In Theology the sub-division which treats of Sin is called Hamartology (from the Greek, *hamartia,* a missing, a failure). Hence it is a missing of the mark set by the revelation of God. It is not a mere trifle, but wilful transgression, involving *guilt.* It is not something that can be condoned by a just and holy God.

III. THE FACT OF SIN.

1. The Biblical Teaching.

There is no book in the world that pictures sin in its terrible reality so fully as does the Bible. It is depicted "line upon line and precept upon precept." Its heinous character is shown by the punishment that was visited on our first parents after their disobedience in the Edenic garden. It brought a sad blight even upon the natural realm. Sin caused the first murder. It was the cause of the destruction of the world by the Noachian deluge, of the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, of the Canaanites (Deut. 9: 4, 5), of the numerous instances of retribution visited upon the people of God. How sin is rebuked in the Psalms, the Proverbs and by all the prophets!

In the New Testament the heinous nature of sin is not minimized. The reason for the incarnation and sacrifice of the eternal Son of God was to save the people from their sins (Matt. 1: 21; 18: 11; Luke 19: 10). The sternest pun-

ishments are denounced against sinners, even by our Lord Himself. Paul speaks of "the exceeding sinfulness of sin." Indeed, the whole Bible bears testimony against sin. In this respect it is unique.

2. The Universal Experience of the Race.

With the teaching of the Bible agrees the consensus of the consciences of the human family. By whatever name it is known, and however varied may be the conceptions of sin among the races of mankind, all people seem to be conscious of a schism in their very nature and of alienation from the supernatural powers that rule the world. Thus it is useless to try to develop a system of ethical data without recognition of the plain and turbulent fact of sin. We are, therefore, led logically to the discussion of a great and vital theme in an ethical system.

3. Moral Distinctions.

(1) *Definition.*

Since this thesis is basic in Christian Ethics, we must be careful to define moral distinctions as accurately as possible:

By moral distinctions we mean the fundamental difference and antagonism between right and wrong.

Emphasis should be laid on the word "antagonism." The right and the wrong are forever and ever opposed to each other; no truce can be declared between them.

(2) *Biblical Teaching.*

Here again the Bible is clear, as it is on all fundamental matters. The distinction between right and wrong is never blurred. It appears in the prohibition in the garden of Eden, for the forbidden tree was expressly called "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil." How explicit was the distinction at the very beginning of human history!

The prophet exlaimed: "Woe unto them that call evil good and good evil; that put darkness for light and light for darkness" (Isa. 5: 20)!

(3) *Other proofs.*

a. The universal human consciousness bears witness to the difference between good and evil; b. It is a postulate of human society; c. It is a fundamental presupposition of all human order and government; d. The human body itself is so constituted that righteousness generally makes for health, while many sins destroy bodily vigor and often bring premature death; e. Differences of moral judgments do not obliterate moral distinctions, because, in spite of them all, conscience persists in approving the one and condemning the other; f. Right and wrong in some instances may be hard to differentiate, but such cases are rather the exception than the rule; and, besides, as soon as an obscure case becomes clarified, the distinction between right and wrong shines forth.

(4) *The so-called "morally indifferent sphere."*

We hold that this is a misnomer. There are many situations in life in which the question of *wrong* does not arise, when men may choose between two or more *right* courses. We would call this the sphere of "the altogether right," for no moral being can live in a sphere or a state that is morally indifferent.

(5) *A higher and a lower good.*

James Martineau seemed to make morality consist chiefly in choosing a higher good in the presence of a lower. Of course, there are such situations in this complex world, and then it is wrong to elect the lower good. But a complete ethical life cannot be built on such a principle, because there

are many states and acts that are positively right, while others are just as positively wrong. No one would say that lying, stealing and adultery are lower goods; they are evil and only evil.

(6) *Questions of casuistry.*

The term "casuistry" in Ethics means *difficult cases of conscience.* That such cases exist no one will deny. "I do here perceive a divided duty." We speak of "doubtful amusements." We rightly ask the question, "Is a lie ever justifiable?"[1]

In regard to the former, if they are "doubtful," they were better abstained from. Conscience should never be tampered with. As for a lie, it is never justifiable, if you will properly define a lie. A lie is an untruth told or acted for the purpose of deceiving others in order to gain some unworthy end. Parables and allegories are not falsehoods. A fictitious story, which the author frankly intends as fiction, could not be classed as a lie. In certain athletic games ruses of various kinds are permissible because they are agreed upon by all participants as a part of the game. However, as soon as a player is discovered breaking a rule of the game, he and his party are penalized.

A safe motto for doubtful transactions is, "Better not." Says the Scripture: "Abstain from every appearance of evil." A good motto here is, "Touch not, taste not, handle not."

---

1. Murray, *A Handbook of Christian Ethics,* pp. 311-315; Mc Cunn, *The Making of Character;* Vincent, *Better Not;* Brooks, *The Modern Dance;* Edwards, *Christianity and Amusements.*

CHAPTER VIII

IV. THE GENESIS OF SIN.

1. A Crucial Problem.

Perhaps few problems have agitated the human mind more seriously than this problem. How often the question arises, "Whence came sin and suffering?" Also: "Why were they permitted to enter the world?" Many volumes have been written on the subject, but no merely human solution has ever proved satisfactory. Let us, therefore, first appeal to the Holy Scriptures.

2. The Biblical Solution.

(1) *The Bible does not create the problem.*

So many skeptics seem to blame the Bible for the presence of sin and sorrow in the world. But the Bible does not create the problem. If the Bible had not been written, or if it were not true, we still would have the problem of sin on our hands. And it would be more puzzling than now; indeed, absolutely insoluble. If men want to blame God, they can gain no help by such an accusation; for the Power that controls the world, whatever it is, either brought sin into the world or else permitted it to enter. So how does it help our thinking to reject the Bible, which merely attempts to give a rational explanation of the way sin gained entrance into our world? But what is the Biblical solution of our problem?

(2) *The sin of angels.*

According to the most obvious interpretation of the Biblical doctrine, the first created moral beings were the angels. If that is so, the origin of sin in God's universe must be as follows:

The origin of sin is due to the first wrong choice of a free moral agent.

If sin is sin in the sense of guilt, there can be no other solution. Sin must be a free act in order to be sin. Otherwise it would be merely misfortune. Some of the angels, according to the Bible, became jealous of God's power and majesty, yielded to the feeling instead of rejecting it, and thus rebelled against the divine government. This is what is meant by the fall of the angels. Their sin converted them into demons or evil spirits. Their leader no doubt was Satan, who is known as the arch adversary of God. Then he or one of his emissaries entered the Edenic garden and inveigled the progenitors of the human race, thus bringing sin into our world.

(3) *The Fall of Man.*

The story of the Fall as it is given in Genesis III can be shown to be rational throughout. It need not be regarded as a myth or legend nor interpreted as an allegory. It may be accepted as actual history. It *should* be so accepted.[1]

We would, therefore, define the origin of sin on this earth thus: *it was due io the wrong choice of the first free moral agents placed here.* Thus they corrupted their nature and entailed sinful depravity upon their posterity. Is this solution of the problem reasonable?

1. For a somewhat extended treatment of the Biblical doctrine of the Fall of man, see the author's *Man's First Disobedience.*

3. The Rationale of the Biblical Solution.

(1) The progenitors of the race must have been *real* people. The human family could not have descended from mythological or legendary ancestors.

(2) Being *real* people, they must have lived in a *real* environment. According to the Bible, their original habitat was a garden, not a jungle. They had real minds and bodies; they lived in a natural realm, with real soil, real grass, real trees, real animals.

(3) They were moral beings endued with conscience and the power of choice. They were not mere happy, irresponsible machines or animals. They did not live in a mere "fools' paradise." Their moral character is implied in the fact that they were forbidden to eat of "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil," while they were bidden to eat of the fruit of all the other trees. The reason why God used a tree — a real tree, not a mythical or allegorical one — as the means for testing them is, they were physical as well as psychical beings; therefore the test, in order to be real and consistent, had to appeal to their whole dual nature.

(4) The subtle serpent was not evil in itself, for God had created it, and had previously pronounced His whole creation "very good." But it was acute and attractive, and therefore became the most suitable instrument for Satan's use. Since a moral agent must have an adequate test in order to exercise his freedom of choice, it is probable that God permitted the evil spirit to enter the garden to afford such an ordeal. But God did not permit the evil spirit to *coerce* our first parents. The evil one *tempted* them, but he did not *force* them to eat of the inhibited fruit. Let us remember this fact, as it is vitally important. The form

in which Satan came, while it constituted a real trial, was not of such a character as to overwhelm or overpower the original pair.

(5) Why did God constitute our first parents moral agents? Because moral beings are of a vastly higher order than are mere automata. Let us think it through. Try to think of God making a universe of mere mechanisms only to sit by and watch them go on and on forever! How preposterous! Moral excellence is the highest kind of excellence. People who find fault with the Biblical explanation care only for pleasure; they are Hedonists. They want to shirk responsibility.

(6) In a moral economy, such as the world evidently is, sin is a *possibility*, but not a *necessity*. Our first parents never should have converted that possibility into an actuality.

(7) They were to *blame* for their disobedience. God had given them a fair chance. They were surrounded by beauty and utility; they were bidden to eat of all the trees of the garden with only one exception. They were duly warned. They had no valid excuse for their disobedience.

(8) A graphic and realistic touch in the Biblical narrative is the fact that Adam and Eve became conscious and ashamed of their nakedness. Sin always brings ugliness and shame. Their original robe of righteousness was all beautiful.

(9) Then they tried to hide from God. How realistic! How true to human experience even today! Men who sin against God always want to hide from Him; to shut Him out of their thoughts; even to get rid of Him by denying His existence; and at the last day they will call on the hills to fall on them and hide them from the eye of God. On

the other hand, people who are right with God welcome both His presence and His inspection.

(10) Their attempt to shift the blame for their offense on others is a most graphic and realistic touch. It is descriptive of human nature today – making a "homology" that would seem to point to the race's descent from the primeval pair in Eden.

(11) God's punishment was distributed equably toward all the offenders – an early instance of true justice, showing the highly ethical character of Biblical teaching.

(12) Since man was the federal and organic head of the natural realm, it was consistent that, when he fell, nature, too, should share in the lapse. God cursed the ground, and placed a blight upon all nature, just as we see nature to be today. Paul says, "The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now" (Rom. 8: 18-23). Thus we can account for the imperfect working of nature without believing that God created her in her present lapsed and blighted condition.

(13) The primitive pair, after their sin, could not remain in the midst of a perfect environment; its glory would have burned into their souls. They had to be driven from the Edenic garden, and placed in surroundings that were in accord with their fallen nature.

(14) What became of the garden of Eden? is a question with which Christian Ethics may deal. Our reply is: As long as God's grace and glory remained immanent in it and shone upon it, it retained its paradisaical beauty and character; but presently they were, no doubt, withdrawn, and then the garden was permitted to be merged into the rest of lapsed nature, and thus its site was lost.

But, if we may here relieve the gloom by anticipating what will be developed later on, the time will come when God will again glorify the realm of nature – will, indeed, re-imparadise the world.

4. Refutation of Erroneous Views.

(1) God is not the author of sin. This is not a tolerable view. It would make God and the world irrational. Could such a universe continue? If God were to do wrong, would not all things plunge to ruin and destruction?

(2) Sin is not eternal. That, too, is an intolerable conception. If sin were eternal, it would not be sin; it would be a matter of necessity. Besides, it could never be overcome, and that would give us a hopeless world. It would spell the eclipse of faith, hope and love. The Biblical explanation is much more rational.

(3) Sin is not posited in matter. Plato held that view, as did the Gnostics and Manicheans. But moral evil cannot begin nor inhere in insensate and impersonal substance. It is something psychical, having its origin in an act of the will.

(4) The first sin in Eden was not sexual cohabitation, because God commanded the first pair to "be fruitful and multiply" (Gen. 1: 28), and surely He would not have punished them for carrying out His command. Moreover, there is no parallelism between the eating of the fruit of a tree and the act just named.

(5) Sin is not a lapse of the Infinite. This is the Hindu doctrine, and is held by some pantheists of the present time. But the Infinite could suffer no such catastrophe or it would not be infinite. Infinity means absolute perfection.

(6) The doctrine of a finite God has been introduced

to relieve God from blame for permitting evil to enter the world. Being finite, He could not prevent its entrance.

But this is a hopeless view; for if God was unable to exclude sin from the world, how will He ever be able to overcome it? Men can afford Him no aid, for He created them, and thus their power can add nothing to His power. Moreover, most people are so sinful that they are more of a burden than a help to Him in His contest with evil. The Biblical doctrine of an omnipotent and all-wise God is much more rational.

(7) Sin is not the heritage of man's primitive animalism. This is a tenet of the theory of evolution. But it cannot be maintained. It would make God the author of sin, for it would mean that He gave to the animals their fierce and predacious nature, and decreed that it should be entailed as a burdensome heritage upon man.

Besides, animals are not sinful. They live according to their nature. Among wild animals there are no venereal diseases. It would be a strange procedure to develop man from the animals, and then make the legacy of animalism imposed upon them sinful. If the selfish and bloody struggle for existence in the animal kingdom was the method of progress, bringing man into existence, why should it be wrong for men to continue along that bloody route? How much more reasonable and adequate is the Biblical solution of the origin and character of sin!

V. THE EFFECTS OF SIN.

1. Loss of the Divine Image.

Man did not lose his mind, nor were his general psychical powers destroyed; but the original innocence and moral integrity in which he was created were forfeited by

his disobedience. Hence he is utterly unable to save himself.

2. Moral Separation from God.

While God could still come to man in his fallen state, sin caused estrangement between him and God that could only be overcome by the grace and benevolence of God.

3. Moral Inability in Sinful Man.

Since man by his sin had done despite to his moral and spiritual nature, he rendered himself unable to restore himself to the divine favor. God had to intervene.

4. Discord in Man's Own Being.

As long as man obeyed God, the divine will was his center, and therefore all parts of his being functioned harmoniously. When, however, he elected his own will and pleasure as his objective, his life became uncentered and swung about in an eccentric, causing confusion and discord within him.

5. Sin Exposed the Sinful Pair to Divine Punishment.

If the moral economy is to be maintained, justice demands the punishment of the sinner; otherwise the government of God would be destroyed. Hence our first parents brought upon themselves condign penalty, and this fact affords a warning to all their posterity.

6. Therefore Sin is Exceedingly Heinous and Ruinous.

Sin must not be regarded lightly. It is anarchy, rebellion against the divine government. Could it have its way, it would destroy the universe and drag God Himself from His throne. It would turn the cosmos into chaos.

Is there any way by which sin may be overcome and the hurt of the people of the world healed? In our next division we are logically led to consider this question and try to find the answer.

DIVISION V

The Ethical Restoration
(Redemption through Christ)

CHAPTER IX

I. CONNECTING LINK.

In the Christian system every element, every movement, is permeated with ethics. There is no factor that is non-moral. As we have seen, the world itself, besides being a mechanistic system under law, is also a moral economy. The realm of nature was divinely intended to be the arena for man's moral activity and adventure. Man was created a free being; therefore, with the possibility of sinning, but with no inherent coercion leading him to sin.

As we have seen, he disobeyed the divine command, and thus brought sin, misery and death into the world. Being the federal head of the race and the organic head of nature, both shared in man's fall; causing inherited sinfulness in the race and more or less of blight upon nature.

But, although the Bible gives a graphic narrative of the advent of sin into the world and of its baleful effects, it does not leave man and nature in the lurch. At once a plan of redemption, decreed from eternity ("the Lamb slain from the foundations of the world"), was set in operation. According to Biblical Ethics and Theology, this plan involves a *restoration* of a fallen world to its pristine estate

of moral and spiritual excellence, plus whatever glory may be added in and at the end of the process. While the method is progressive, as the Bible indicates, yet it is not a matter of mere evolution from an imperfect state to an increasingly developed state. That is not at all consistent with the Biblical doctrine, which plainly teaches that God's method was to send His Son into the world to undo and overcome the evil brought into the world by Adam in his Fall. This plan involved a supernatural procedure. The incarnate Son of God was not a product of the evolution of the race.

But how is this restoration of the fallen world to be effected? Merely by a divine fiat of amnesty whereby pardon and sadvation are bestowed upon sinners without any satisfaction to the eternal law of justice? Could God simply wave aside that law, and forgive sin out of hand? If so, who would respect His government? Who would fear His justice? No; the principles of morality require that the moral government of the universe be upheld. This leads to our next section.

II. THE RESTORATION EFFECTED BY REDEMPTION.

Whatever human speculation may think, the Bible plainly teaches that a Redeemer was sent into the world to save that which was lost; to bring back to man the divine favor and blessing and righteousness which the first Adam forfeited. The chief factor in Christ's mission here on earth was to "give His life a ransom for the many;" to "shed His blood for the remission of sins." "Him who knew no sin He made to be sin on our behalf; that we might become the righteousness of God in Him" (2 Cor. 5: 21).

As has been said, God wrought out His redemptive plan historically and progressively. Let us note the lofty ethical character of the Christian method of redemption.

III. ETHICAL PREPARATION FOR REDEMPTION.

1. In the Gentile World.

This thesis can be developed only in outline form. Note the following points: (1) Flashes of truth and aspiration in human philosophy (Plato especially); (2) Despair of human religion and philosophy; (3) Dominion of the Roman empire; (4) A general condition of peace over the world; (5) General use of the Greek language; (6) Convenient means of travel by land and sea; (7) "The fullness of time" with the Gentiles. All these factors have their ethical implications in preparing for the coming of an ethical Redeemer.

2. In the Old Testament Dispensation.

(1) By providential care and guidance; (2) By special inspiration of godly men; (3) By a chosen people fitted to be the carriers of the plan; (4) By types and symbols; (5) By moral precept and command; (6) By promise and prophecy; (7) "The fullness of time" in the Hebrew world.

These various topics might easily be developed at some length in showing their ethical significance. For example, under the first division one might show that God's care over His people consisted in His rewarding and blessing them whenever they obeyed His laws and walked uprightly, and in admonishing and punishing them when they departed from the way of righteousness. Through His prophets He also sought to guide them in the right way. Under the second section, the ethical implication is that the Holy Spirit's inspiration ever gave to God's people a revelation that

was holy, and that He sought and found men of high moral character to be His amanuenses; the result of which combination was a holy Book, the Bible.

The consideration of the ethical preparation leads us logically to the next topic.

IV. THE REDEMPTION THROUGH CHRIST.

1. The Moral Excellence of the Redeemer.

In the nature of the case the Redeemer of the world must be holy. A sinful being could not redeem sinners, because he himself would need a redeemer. Therefore the teaching of the Bible on this point is in accord with the demands of reason and the science of Ethics: "For such a high priest became us, holy, guileless, undefiled, separate from sinners, made higher than the heavens" (Heb. 7: 26); "Yet without sin" (4:15); "Him who knew no sin He made to be sin" (2 Cor. 5: 21); "Who did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth" (1 Pet. 2: 22); "Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that He might bring us to God" (1 Pet. 3: 18).

2. Ethics of the Kenosis.

That there is a sense in which the Son of God "emptied Himself" is the clear teaching of God's Word (Phil. 2: 7). However, this does not mean that He renounced His Deity, or made Himself a sinner, or so limited Himself that He fell into error in His teaching; but He refrained for the time being from exercising and manifesting His divine glory and majesty. Besides, it was not His divine nature (which, indeed, He possessed in common with the Father and the Son) that was humiliated, but His divine person in and through His assumed human nature.

This is the doctrine, but what is its ethical content? Answer: The spirit of beneficence it reveals, of condescension, of sacrifice, of holy accommodation to human need. When men humble themselves for the good of others, we approve of their acts. Whence comes such a spirit ultimately, save from the self-abnegating principle in the nature of the Son of God?

3. Ethics of the Miraculous Conception of Christ.

The proof of the doctrine of the virgin birth of our Lord belongs to Dogmatics and Apologetics. The gospels of Matthew and Luke teach it explicitly, and therefore the quarrel of the person who denies the doctrine is with the Holy Scriptures, not with evangelical believers. But, taking it for granted as a doctrine, what is its ethical import? It insures the sinless character of Christ's assumed human nature; for if it was begotten in the seminal being of the virgin Mary by the Holy Spirit, it must have been purified from all sin in the process. The Holy Spirit did not ensphere the person of the Son of God in corrupt human nature, but in pure, pristine human nature as it came originally from the creative power of God. Hence, being Himself sinless in His human nature and also divine in nature and person, Jesus Christ was in every way fitted morally and potentially to be the world's Redeemer.

4. Ethics of the Incarnation.

The assumption of our human nature by the eternal Son of God proves His holy affection for man, in that He was willing to place Himself on man's level in order that He might befriend him in the most loving and intimate way. "And the Word became flesh and tabernacled among us" (John 1: 14). "How condescending and how kind was

God's eternal Son!" Man could not have stood in the presence of an unveiled theophany. Hence the Son of God veiled His glory and majesty in human form.

5. Ethical Value of Christ's Example.

No doubt one of the primary purposes of the divine incarnation was to afford men a real, concrete and perfect example of human living in the midst of environments of temptation and affliction. It was not an example of a divine Being that man needed, but a human example. We can conceive of no other way in which the Son of God could have lived a model human life before men for their inspiration and encouragement save by becoming incarnate – that is, by assuming human nature and functioning in and through it.

6. Ethical Influence of Christ's Display of Divine Love.

To know that God loves us is most comforting and reassuring. To know that He loves us enough to "give Himself for us" in utmost humiliation and self-sacrifice is most appealing to the very best that is in us. How could such love have been displayed except through a divine incarnation and expiatory sacrifice?

7. Ethical Motivization from Christ's Teaching.

By becoming incarnate the Son of God could live and move among men and teach them His holy and uplifting doctrines without overawing them. This was the ethical and psychological method – to teach men, to inspire them, to save them through their own apprehension and acceptance of truth revealed to them by instruction. God pursued the normal pedagogical method of bringing the knowledge of salvation to men.

8. Ethical Demand for Vicarious and Substitutional Atonement.

This doctrine is abundantly validated by Biblical teaching, and it is the business of Biblical Theology to establish the doctrine. But why does Christian Ethics demand expiation for sin? Because, while love and mercy motivated God in sending His Son (John 3: 16) and the Son in coming to save the world, the principles of moral government could not be waved aside merely by divine power and fiat. The eternal principle of justice had also to be upheld and vindicated. Any violation of that principle would have been unethical – yes, catastrophic in the world and to the nature of God.

The Triune God is the eternal source of the law of justice; therefore, one person of the Trinity could become incarnate, place Himself under the law, suffer the penalty of transgression in the place of sinners, and thus show them love, grace and mercy without derogating from the majesty of the law. The heinousness of sin and the majesty of the law are revealed nowhere more impressively than on Calvary where the Son of God Himself had to pay the penalty before man could be justified and saved.

Therefore the so-called "moral influence" theory of the atonement is the reverse of moral, because it violates the eternal principle of justice. In the atonement by the incarnate Son of God "mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other" (Ps. 85: 10).

10. Ethical Value of Christ's Ubiquity.

That Christ is ever present with His people is a most precious doctrine. "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world;" "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them;"

"Christ in you, the hope of glory." If men are conscious of the personal presence of the pure, white Christ, surely they will desire to be pure in heart and live pure outward lives. They would not want to do anything unseemly. More than that, His personal presence is a precious comfort and help to the Christian.

V. OBJECTS OF REDEMPTION.

1. MAN.

(1) As far as we know, he is *the only being* who is salvable: no offer of salvation is given in the Scriptures to the evil spirits.

(2) His *moral depravity* and *inability* are evident. He is "dead in trespasses and sins." He can in nowise set himself free from sin's bondage, nor cleanse himself from its defilement. Hence some power outside of himself must come to him and save him. For this ethical purpose the plan of redemption through Christ was decreed and set into operation through the pure love and grace of God.

(3) His *actual offenses,* after he comes to the age of responsibility, greatly aggravate his status before God. Yet God is willing to forgive and save.

(4) *His relation to the Law.*

"Through the law comes the knowledge of sin." The holy law of God condemns him. The law cannot save him, and was not intended to save him, because he is an offender against the law. Moreover, being a sinner, and therefore morally disabled, he cannot keep the holy law of God. He needs help from another source. After he has been saved, the law becomes his guide and standard of conduct.

(5) *His relation to the Gospel.*

The Gospel is God's offer of salvation. Convicted of sin and rendered contrite by the law (which is holy), he is turned to the proffers of the Gospel. Here he beholds Christ as the expiatory Saviour, faith is begotten within him, and he accepts Christ as his Redeemer. Then that gracious ethical transformation, called salvation, takes place within him.

2. The Cosmos.

Since the natural realm suffered a lapse with the Fall of man (Gen. 3: 14-19), its organic head, the promise is that the creation, too, "shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God" (Rom. 8: 18-23). There is also the promise of "new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness" (2 Pet. 3: 13).

The ethical import of these precious and inspiring promises lies in the fact that the natural realm shall be purified of all physical corruption, in order that it may be a fit habitat for beings who are spiritually pure and holy. No other kind of residence would be accordant.

CHAPTER X

VI. THE APPLICATION OF REDEMPTION.

1. The Ethical Agent.

The incarnate Son of God wrought what is called in Theology "the objective redemption." But in order that the process may be spiritual and ethical, the redemption thus wrought for us must be applied. It must not be imposed upon men in a mechanical, coercive and arbitrary way. There are ethical laws that must be observed.

The Scriptures teach that it is the office of the Holy Spirit, the third Person of the Trinity, to apply redemption in accordance with ethical and psychological principles. Perhaps He, being the innermost Person of the Godhead, is consistently chosen to perform the innermost spiritual work in the souls of men. That at least would seem to be the logical procedure.

Note the high ethical principles involved in the divine method: the Holy Spirit would always perform ethical operations; He would do a holy work in consistence with His holy nature. The plan of redemption is ethical throughout. No breach is made anywhere in the ethical law.

2. The Ethical Means Employed.

(1) *The Word of God.*

The Holy Spirit does not come down out of the blue. He employs what are known as the *means of grace.* The chief of these is the Word of God. It is only through the

Holy Scriptures that we know about Christ, His atoning sacrifice for sin, the Holy Spirit and His gracious functions. No one is ever converted in the Christian way except as he is instructed in the Word.

But the Bible, being divinely inspired, is holy; its teaching is replete with the right, and it everywhere condemns the wrong. Therefore the chief vehicle of grace is ethical.

(2) The Sacraments.

Since the Word of God is holy, and since the sacraments received their efficacy only through their connection with the Word, it follows logically that they must themselves partake of that quality, and therefore are ethical means through which God bestows His favor upon those who properly use them. Thus the use of them is truly ethicized in the Christian sense of the term. According to the Lutheran view, in baptism regeneration is conferred, and that must be an ethical work, being begotten by the Holy Spirit. In the Lord's Supper Christ Himself, being really present, is received into the soul, and thus again an ethical work has been wrought.

3. The Ethical Assembly: the Christian Church.

(1) Doctrinal Theology establishes the fact from the Holy Scriptures that the Christian Church is a *divine institution* (Matt. 16:18; 18:17; Acts 2:47; 15:22; 20:28; Eph. 5:23-27; 1 Tim. 3:5, 15). This being so, the Church must be essentially holy, ethical. Moreover, as the true spiritual Church is composed of regenerated persons, it must be essentially righteous.

Being a divine institution, it becomes the duty of every one to become regenerated and identify himself with the Church. Should it be said that this does not imply belong-

ing to an organization, we would answer: the followers of Christ could never accomplish their divinely appointed work of upholding the Christian faith and carrying it to the ends of the earth without coming together in organized bodies. The Christian Church today is composed of the various evangelical churches which are true to its original institution and purpose. Therefore it is the duty of every one to belong to the Church in one or another of its various forms, not in order to be saved, but in order to help fulfill Christ's command to "go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature."

4. The Ethical Order of Salvation.

(1) *Its doctrinal basis.*

Evangelical scholars, by a thorough examination and correlation of Scripture, have wrought out the several orderly movements of the Holy Spirit in applying the objective redemption which Christ wrought out for the fallen race. The author believes that this order is Biblical, consistent with the *rationale* of God's work with the human soul, and in accord with the principles of scientific psychology. He therefore accepts it without further ado, and proceeds to depict its ethical elements in the several steps.

(2) *Its Ethical elements.*

a. *Vocation.*

This is the call of God to awaken the sinner to his unsaved condition. It is a holy calling to foresake sin and seek salvation.

b. *Illumination.*

In this process the Holy Spirit through the Word of God uses the law to convict the sinner of his sins and to show

him his moral and spiritual helplessness. "Through the law cometh the knowledge of sin."

c. *Repentance or godly sorrow for sin.*

This state is the result of the previous process. It is highly ethical, because it means not only contrition, but also a desire to be freed from the unethical status. Repentance (*metanoia*) means a change of mind – that is, of the intellect, the heart, and the will.

d. *Passive faith.*

The convicted sinner may struggle and try to save himself for a time, as Luther did, but until he is willing to surrender to God, who alone can save him, the work will not proceed. The Holy Spirit operates upon him until he passively permits God to save him; then the next divine function takes place.

e. *Regeneration.*

As soon as the convicted sinner gives himself up completely into God's hands, the Holy Spirit begets the new life within him. It is an ethical life because it is begotten by the Holy Spirit.

f. *Active or justifying faith.*

By the work of the Holy Spirit, begetting the new spiritual life, passive faith is converted into active faith, which lays hold upon Christ and His merit according to the proffer of the Gospel. This faith is a good (ethical) work, because it is begotten by the Holy Spirit and accepts the righteous Saviour.

g. *Justification.*

The soul that accepts Christ is justified – that is, all that Christ did for the sinner by His active and passive obedi-

ence is counted over in his behalf. This is both a forensic and a paternal act on God's part.

It is highly ethical, because it removes all pride and self-righteousness from the human heart, and fills it with pure love and gratitude to God for His gratuitous gift of pardon and salvation. There will be no boasting in heaven among the justified. They will give all the praise to the Redeeming God.

No antimonianism is encouraged in this gracious plan, because: confession and abandonment of sin are required at the beginning; the whole process saves from sin; therefore it would be impossible for the saved person to live in sin (see Rom. 6:1, 2, 15-8).

h. *Conversion.*

This term is here used in the widest sense, and therefore includes all the preceding movements. It means to change thoroughly (*con,* with, and *verto,* to change). Its ethical import lies in the fact that it is a transition from a life of sin to one of righteousness. "Conversion is the work of the Holy Spirit by which, through faith in Christ, we turn (or are turned) from darkness to light and from the power of Satan unto God." Ethical, ethical throughout.

i. *The Mystical Union.*

This means that the truly converted person is united in spiritual fellowship with the Triune God. Its ethical quality consists in the holy relation of the believer with the Source of all good.

j. *Sanctification.*

This term is here used to designate a progressive work and experience —"growth in grace and in the knowledge of

Jesus Christ" (2 Pet. 3:18; Phil. 3:13-16; Heb. 6:1-3; 12: 1, 2). Surely growth in goodness is an ethical process.

k. *Glorification.*

This refers to the consummation of the Christian's earthly life and his entrance into heaven, in which he is in a state of ethical perfection and glory. Thus we are led to the final sub-division of our system of Theoretical Ethics.

VII. THE CONSUMMATION OF REDEMPTION.

1. The Soul Perfected at Death.

This does not occur automatically by the separation of the soul from the body, for the body is not the seat of moral evil (as Plato and the Manicheans taught); but the soul is purified from all the remains of sin by an act of God before it is admitted into heaven. This is not an arbitrary or coercive divine act, but one to which the believing soul gladly assents and which it has desired through all its earthly life.

2. The Intermediate State.

In Protestant Theology this does not mean the Roman Catholic condition of purgatory, but the state of the soul between death and the resurrection. It is the disembodied state, and is temporary. Ethically speaking, the souls of true believers are dwelling in blissful fellowship with God, and are known as "the spirits of just men made perfect." Even though they may be awaiting the restoration of the body, their joy is full; yet it will be enhanced when the final consummation takes place.

3. The Final Judgment and the Resurrection.

The fact that men must look forward to the divine judgment and "give an account of the deeds done in the body

has a wholesome effect upon their faith and their Christianly moral life. Much restraint would be lost if men felt they would never be called to account.

It would be wrong were the body not to be raised from the dead and glorified; for, since Satan brought death into the world, the victory over him would not be complete if it should have compassed the eternal destruction of the body. Then it could not be said truly, "The last enemy that shall be abolished is death" (1 Cor. 15:26). The glorified body, purified of all defilement, shall be a fit temple for the purified soul – and this, again is the highest ethical state.

4. The Purity and Glory of the Future State.

Its ethical quality shall be its immaculate purity, moral and physical. Every reference to the future life in the Bible connotes absolute purity. All the imagery employed in the book of Revelation suggests purity. "Nothing that defileth nor worketh abomination nor maketh a lie shall enter therein" (Rev. 21:27). Only those are there who "have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb" (Rev. 7:13-17). There shall also be "new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness" (2 Pet. 3:13).

PART II
PRACTICAL ETHICS

DIVISION I
Introductory Data

CHAPTER XI

I. DEFINITION.

Practical Ethics is the systematic treatment of the application of moral principles to human life.

This treatment of Ethics is a part of the *science* just as much as is Theoretical Ethics. The actual carrying out of the principles in human life may be called the *art* of Ethics.

II. ITS RELATION TO THEORETICAL ETHICS.

1. A Vital Relation.

If the right kind of principles have been laid down in the first Part of this work, the practical Part should bear the same connection with it as the fruit bears to the living tree. This conception carried into practice will make the actor sincere through and through. There will be no camouflage. His principles and his practices will agree.

2. A Vitally Important Relation.

It is all-important for men to hold the right ethical principles. In Christian Ethics it makes a great deal of differ-

ence what a man believes, what his inner faith is. "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he," is much profounder ethically than the modernistic saying, "No matter what you believe, just so you live right." The fact is, if a man believes one thing and lives another, he is not genuine through and through. The only truly ethical life is to believe the truth and live the truth. The inner and the outer life must agree. *Be right and do right* – that is the complete ethical law. The Bible everywhere inculcates inner and outer purity. "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me;" "God weigheth the hearts;" "I believed; therefore have I spoken."

On the other hand, as men are constituted, we know that they must often make an effort of the will to bring their conduct into accord with the principles they know and accept. "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." One might think that the practical life would simply flow spontaneously from the right inner principles, but experience proves that such is not the case. Therefore Practical Ethics is necessary to complete our science and to make it truly serviceable.

III. SUBJECT-MATTER OF PRACTICAL ETHICS.

The subject-matter of Practical Ethics is *the Christian moral life of faith, love and service*. As will be shown later, this life is all involved in the word "duty" when rightly defined.

IV. BASIS OF THE CHRISTIANLY ETHICAL LIFE.

1. It is not the life of the natural man; not merely the natural evolution of forces natively in the "subconscious" mind (co-called). "The natural man receiveth not the

things of the Spirit of God;" "The carnal mind is enmity against God, and is not subject to the law of God;" "That which is born of the flesh is flesh;" "For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing" (Rom. 7:18; here the word "flesh," *sarx*, refers to man's carnal nature). Whatever morality may be developed from the mere natural man, it cannot be called Christian morality.

2. The Christian moral life is dependent on the redeeming work of Christ. Without acceptance of Christ and His redemptive work no true spiritually ethical relationship can be established between God and man. The natural man is still under the law of condemnation until he accepts the divine plan of salvation.

3. The potential principles of the Christianly moral life, as well as the spiritual life, are begotten in man's soul by the Holy Spirit in regeneration, and from that germinal source it is progressively developed by the correlation of divine grace and the unfettered human will. From the Christian viewpoint, one may well ask whether a man can be truly moral unless he loves the God who gave the Bible to the world, who sent His Son to redeem mankind, and who freely offers amnesty to all who will repent and believe. It must be a superficial conception of ethical principles which could answer that question in the affirmative. Christian morality plows deep.

V. THE CHRISTIAN CONCEPTION OF DUTY.

The term *duty* may seem to many people to imply difficult and disagreeable tasks, and no doubt it often does involve that idea. In Christian morality, however, duty is irradiated and permeated with love, and is thus converted into delight and privilege. Even the hardest task may be-

come a pleasure when the heart is filled with the love of God. Hence we shall freely use the word *duty* throughout this part of our work, remembering that it is not used in the hard, rigorous sense of Stoicism, but in the transfigured Christian sense.

VI. MAN'S CHIEF DUTIES.

1. Duties to God.

(1) *To recognize Him.*

It surely cannot be said to be moral to ignore one's Creator, Preserver and Redeemer. It is even regarded as impolite to accept favors from one's fellows without recognizing and thanking the giver. Will men not treat God, the Giver of all good gifts, even with common politeness? "In everything give thanks."

(2) *To repent before Him.*

As soon as men come to recognize God and enter into His presence, they become conscious of their sinfulness. They feel that the good and holy God cannot look upon sin with any degree of allowance. This begets a feeling of conviction and contrition. The only ethical course then is to repent and ask God for pardon. In the Christian view it is eminently unethical to refuse to confess and forsake one's sins (Prov. 28:13).

(3) *To accept His gracious offer of salvation.*

Since God has provided salvation for men at the cost of the sacrifice of His only begotten Son, we may well question whether it is right – that is, ethical – to ignore and refuse His proffered gift. Is it moral to trample upon love, and especially divine love?

(4) *To love, trust and obey Him.*

At the risk of some repetition, it is pertinent to say that, since God loves us with a paternal and self-abnegating love, we ought to love Him in return. It is also right to trust Him; to fail to do so is tantamount to calling his probity and goodness in question. And surely to obey Him is the only ethical course.

(5) *To pray to Him and worship Him.*

"I will be inquired of," says God in His book. He may know what men need without their asking, but it is better for them to ask. They will appreciate all the more what they desire enough to ask for. Prayer brings the soul into communion with God, and surely that advances the holy life.

There is also much ethical value in worship. Just as men are made better and more refined by the contemplation of beauty, so they are lifted to a higher plane of thought and life when they adore the highest Being, God.

(6) *To walk consistently before Him in the world.*

"Be ye circumspect," says the Word. "Provide things honest in the sight of all men;" "Let your light so shine;" "Let not your good be evil spoken of;" "Let none of you suffer as an evil doer." Disciples must not bring reproach upon their Master. The best translation of the gospel is a holy life according to its principles.

(7) *To proclaim and defend the gospel.*

Surely the true disciple will want to pass the blessing on. What has filled his life with joy will also help his fellowmen. Remember the old hymn, "Can we whose souls lighted," etc.? And surely, when the gospel is attacked, maligned or misrepresented, the earnest disciple will defend it. He would defend his own good name if it were

smirched. Will he not defend Christ and the gospel? Christ defended Himself more than once. So did Paul and Peter; so did the prophets of old. Some one has said, "There is too much defense." Our reply is, Some people never defend the gospel at all, and thus are recreant to their trust. Read 1 Pet. 3:15; Jude 3; Paul's defense before Agrippa and on Mars Hill.

(8) *To bear chastisement without murmuring.*

A complaining Christian does not advertise his religion well. There is a good deal of Biblical warning against the murmuring habit. The people of Israel were punished for murmuring. We should remember this: "No chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous: nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruits of righteousness unto them that are exercised thereby" (Heb. 12: 11).

(9) *To anticipate eternal fellowship with Him.*

He that truly loves God desires such eternal fellowship. It would be his greatest grief to be separated from his heavenly Father. There is nothing weak or maudlin about such aspirations. It is a virile thing to desire to live forever, if you desire to live nobly and uprightly in the highest kind of fellowship. Christ promised such fellowship in His winsome saying about "the Father's house of many mansions."

2. Duties to Nature.

These may be summed up briefly, and yet the theme might be greatly amplified: (1) To trace God's power and wisdom in her forms and operations (Ps. 19); (2) To study her phenomena scientifically (what a wide and suggestive field!); (3) To preserve and develop her (the first occupation given to man, Gen. 1: 28; 2: 15); (4) To show mercy to all her sentient creatures.

CHAPTER XII

VI. MAN'S CHIEF DUTIES (continued).

3. Duties to Oneself.

(1) *To the body.*

a. To keep it pure and clean.

It is intended to be "the temple of the Holy Ghost;" "a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God." Said some one, "Religion is a great face-washer." As soon as people are converted, they appreciate the value of water and soap. A clean soul in a clean body is the ideal ethical life for the Christian.

b. To keep it in the best possible health.

"A sound mind in a sound body," is a good maxim. Of course, there are people who are sickly or invalided when it is not their fault, and they must bear their affliction patiently, and try to remember that "all things work together for good to them that love God, to them that are called according to His purpose." Nevertheless, every one is in duty bound to preserve his bodily health as far as possible by temperate habits, by the use of proper food and drink and by sufficient exercise. There is merit in labor, but none in destroying the health to amass either wealth or learning. How wrong, too, to be gluttonous in eating, to be intemperate in drinking! One who ruins his health by such indulgence sins, not only against himself, but also against God

and society; for everyone owes the best of which he is capable to God's cause and the well-being of the world.

b. To regulate its passions and appetites.

No natural passion is wrong *per se*. All the passions, in their pristine purity, were divinely given and were intended for a moral and spiritual purpose. Therefore the chief duty of man in this respect is to exercise proper control. That was one of the great quartette of virtues inculcated by Plato's ethics. It is not always easy to exercise self-control, but it is part of the discipline of life, and it can be done by a proper use of divine grace in conjunction with a determined effort of the regenerated will.

c. To remember its dignity and destiny.

The human body was fashioned by the Almighty in a wonderful way; not by mere fiat, but a direct and painstaking effort. And a marvellous organism He made it. The Son of God, when He became incarnate (John 1: 14), assumed a human body as well as man's physical nature. What a tribute to this part of man's dual being! The body is intended for an immortal destiny through the resurrection. Therefore we speak of the dignity and final destiny of the human body in God's marvellous plan of creation, preservation and redemption, and that is a thrilling reason why the body should be presented to God as a living sacrifice, devoted to highly ethical purposes.

(2) *To the Mind.*

a. The process of culture.

To be truly ethical every faculty of the human soul should be cultivated in due proportion, and to an extent in keeping with the vocation to which each man or woman has been called. Some vocations require more culture of the

intellect than others, but this does not mean that one useful calling is of a superior grade morally than are others. Each person should have the proper training to be most efficient in his specific business in life.

However, in any calling some education will be of great value for giving more satisfaction to life and enabling one to do more good in the world.

It might be profitable here to consult the Outline of the Human Mind in Chapter II, Division VIII, 2, and reflect on the ethical implications in the culture of the Intellect, the Emotions and the Will. Think of the ethical value of storing the *memory* with true thoughts, with inspiring adages from the Bible and other sources. The benefit of *reflection* on uplifting themes is of inestimable moral value. Says the apostle, after naming a number of beautiful virtues, "Think on these things" (Phil. 4: 8). Too much could not be said, did space permit, on the right cultivation and control of the *emotions.* For example, the Christian should be careful to distinguish between emotion proper and emotionalism. There should be heart in religion, and yet feeling should not degenerate into mere emotionalism.

After men have been regenerated, by which their wills have been set free and enabled by divine grace, they should use them, and never should allow themselves to be swayed by mere feeling or evil passion. They should remember that they are not in the grip of fate or circumstance or heredity or environment; that their wills have been given them to be used. Christians sometimes suffer sad downfalls because they neglect the sturdy use of the will.

b. Motives for culture.

Among the wrong motives may be mentioned: (a) Mere worldly ambition; (b) The expectation of finding an easy

way of making a livelihood or gaining a competence; (c) To be able to exploit, or take advantage of, one's fellowmen. Referring to the last item, a good deal of intellectual knowledge is necessary today to be a successful rascal.

Among the right motives we call attention to the following: (a) The desire for ueeful knowledge – a desire that God has implanted in the human mind; (b) The purpose of injecting good and profitable ideas in the mind, so as to crowd out evil thoughts and propensities –"the expulsive power of a new affection;" (c) Above all, the desire to serve God and do good in the world. The prophet said it well: "The Lord God hath given me the tongue of the learned that I might speak a word in season to him that is weary." To go to college, to secure an education, so that you may be able to do greater and better service – that is the highest motive.

(3) *To one's whole Personality.*

a. After all, while man is a dual being, composed of soul and body, he is an *anteger,* a single personality; therefore we call attention to his ethical culture as a unified being.

b. He should endeavor to build up as *strong* a personality as possible. He should not be weak, anemic. By reliance on divine grace, in conjunction with a proper use of his will, he may, as it were, *potentialize* himself. As much of the psychology of the day teaches, man has resources in his soul that can be called into play if he will make the effort. This principle should be acknowledged and applied, whether one believes in the Freudian philosophy of the "unconscious mind" or not.

c. Every man should cultivate a *symmetrical* personality. There is always danger of onesidedness. All the Christian virtues should be disciplined and developed in

due proportion. Says the Psalmist: "The righteous shall flourish like the palm tree"– an apt comparison, considering the beautiful symmetry of that tree. For example, a woman said, "I help the poor instead of going to church." This is onesided. Why not do both?

d. All that has gone before in this section implies that a *virtuous* personality should be cultivated by the Christian. Here a few definitions are in order:

Virtue is rectitude and virility of character.

The virtues (virtue might be called the *genus*, the virtues the various *species*) are those several ethical qualities that go to make up the character of the truly upright man.

The Christian virtues are those qualities that spring from the life of faith in Christ – that is, the Christianly regenerated life.

It is difficult to classify the virtues. As has been previously shown, Plato's classification is not satisfactory. Perhaps it will be better to treat each virtue separately, and point out its antithesis and perversion, and then try to cultivate each one in the way indicated. Here is a list which may be studied and practiced with profit:

Positive Content	Antithesis	Perversion
Love	Hatred	Sentimentality
Faith	Unbelief	Credulity
Hope	Despair	Ultra-optimism
Humility	Pride	Servility
Firmness	Vacillation	Obstinacy
Courage	Cowardice	Foolhardiness
Self-respect	Self-contempt	Conceit
Fidelity	Perfidy	Indiscriminate Loyalty
Patriotism	Disloyalty	Chauvinism
Veracity	Falsehood	Brusqueness
Sincerity	Insincerity	None
Enthusiasm	Lethargy	Fanaticism
Diligence	Slothfulness	Ultra-assiduity

Affability	Surliness	Sycophancy
Neatness	Slovenliness	Fastidiousness
Individuality	Inanity	Erraticism
Patience	Impatience	Stolidity
Conscientiousness	Unscrupulousness	Squeamishness
Politeness	Boorishness	Effusiveness
Liberality	Stinginess	Prodigality
Dignity	Vulgarity	Superciliousness
Chastity	Licentiousness	Prudery
Self-denial	Self-indulgence	Asceticism

In each case, of course, the positive virtue is to be cultivated, while both the antithesis and the perversion are to be avoided. In many situations in practical life fine discrimination is needed in distinguishing the positive content from its perversion. As examples, it may not always be easy in real life to distinguish between humility and servility; between firmness and obstinacy; between conscientiousness and squeamishness. But we have not been placed in this world merely to have an easy time; therefore we need the discipline of hard thinking and difficult tasks.

CHAPTER XIII

VI. MAN'S CHIEF DUTIES (continued).

4. Duties to One's Fellowmen.

(1) *General relations.*

a. Love.

Among the various kinds of Christian love may be mentioned the following, all of which the true Christian will try to develop to the utmost: (a) Neighbor love – love to every one who is in need, whether near or far, kindred or stranger, of the same social class or of another, of the same race or another (the parable of the Good Samaritan); (b) Patriotic love – love of country, but not Chauvinism; (c) Philanthropic love – love of the *genus homo,* of humanity for its own sake; (d) Love for enemies – often a difficult task, but peculiarly Christian; (e) Graces flowing from Christian love: politeness, appreciation, affability, courtesy.

b. Justice

This means equity among men, each receiving his due as nearly as possible. It is perfectly consistent with love. Indeed, it is plain that, if all men were actuated by true Christian love, no inequalities of an unjust character would exist in society. Imagine how this would help to Edenize the world. So we plead for equity and justice, such as the Bible and the Christian system require and inculcate, in the following relations of life: (a) Among men in general; (b) In the industrial or economic sphere; (c) In civic life

among both officials and citizens. Let Christian love and justice be tried out and see the result.

(2) *Specific relations.*

a. The family.

Marriage is a divine institution (Gen. 1: 27; 2: 18, 21-24); and it was to be monogamous marriage, not sexual promiscuity (cf. Matt. 19: 3-9; Mark 10: 2-12). In choosing a partner for life, care should be taken. Conjugal love need not be blind. It is better to fall in love with a good character than with merely a pretty face and a graceful physical form. Yet marriage should be founded on pure sexual love, involving both soul and body.

There is something peculiar about hymeneal love which distinguishes it from all other kinds of love, like friendship, love of children, love of parents, Platonic love, etc. For this reason such love can truly exist between one man and one woman only. This is the natural basis of conjugal love, and agrees with the teaching of the Bible.

Since all men and women are humanly frail, there is always need that married couples should bear patiently with each other. They must not expect each other to be angelic in disposition. The marriage relation sometimes imposes peculiar trials and difficult responsibilities. If these matters are borne in mind and each party exercises proper self-control, marriage can be made a success. As a certain wag has put it, it is possible "to be happy though married."

So far as regards the relation of parents and children, it is pertinent to say that it is in accordance with the divine order for children to come into the home (Gen. 1: 28). To prevent it would be to disobey the divine command and frustrate the divine purpose. God surely does not approve of race suicide.

Children having come into the home, it is the duty of parents to care for them, to train them in the way of God's purpose and commandments. "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old, he will not depart therefrom" (Prov. 22: 6). Fathers should not provoke their children to anger (Eph. 6: 4); yet they should kindly and firmly insist on obedience. Anarchy in the home leads to anarchy in the school, the State, and the government of God.

The duties of children to parents are plainly taught in God's Word. They are to honor them (Ex. 20: 12) and obey them (Eph. 6:1; Col. 3: 20). As parents should care for their children when they are young and dependent, so children should care for their parents in their old age. The time never comes when children should not honor father and mother.

b. The social organism.

Man was created a social being. There never was a time when it was "good for man to be alone." Any kind of asceticism or monasticism that leads men and women to separate themselves from the social organism is contrary to the ethical teaching of the Bible. A man cannot find God in a hermitage when he ought to be mingling with his fellowmen in the way of fellowship and service. The life of the anchorite is selfish; therefore contrary to the very principles of Christianity. Christ identifies Himself with the people. What we do for them, He says we do for Him (Matt. 25: 40, 45. While it is not accurate to speak of "the social gospel," it is important to recognize the *social element in* the gospel – yes, and to practice it, too.

c. The State.

The State is a divine institution. The Bible always recognizes government. It does not place the divine endorse-

ment on any particular form of government; but it does teach just what nature and reason teach – that human society cannot exist in a state of anarchy.

That being so, it follows that people should be obedient to the government under which they live, provided it does not command anything directly contrary to the divine order. Hence Christ said, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's." The apostles also enjoined upon Christians to "be subject to the powers that be" (Rom. 13: 1; Titus 3:1; 1 Pet 2: 13-17). Christian people should not be rebellious and revolutionary. There may, however, be extreme circumstances in which they "ought to obey God rather than man" (Acts 5: 29). Even then it does not mean that they are to become seditious. The motto of citizens and rulers in a country like ours should be, "Liberty regulated by law."

d. The Church.

(a) Membership therein obligatory.

Since the Church is a divine institution (Matt. 16:1 8; 18: 17; Eph. 1: 22; 5: 23-25; Acts 7: 38; 20: 28; 1 Cor. 11:22), it surely must follow that every one should be a member thereof. This does not mean that people must join the Church in order to be saved, but that they will join the Church when they are saved. Then they will desire to have fellowship in some organization of believers in order to further the cause of religion. It is false individualism which declares that membership in some Christian communion is not necessary in order to be a Christian. Without questioning motives, he surely would be a poor sort of a Christian who tried to be one all alone. What reason that would stand in the judgment day could he give for refusing to ally himself with his fellow-believers in the work of the Lord?

(b) Duties of lay members.

This section might be indefinitely amplified, but we can give only the outline, hoping it will be suggestive of further thought: Christians should attend upon the means of grace in the Church regularly (Ps. 122: 1, 9; Heb. 1: 25), give God glad and spiritual worship; give the Church proper financial support ("according as the Lord has prospered you"); they should live circumspectly before the world in order to commend the Church as a divine institution.

c. Duties of ministers.

They should be leaders of the flock; wise and tender under-shepherds; but should not seek to be "ecclesiastical bosses."

They should be the expert workmen of the Church. It is their specialty. They have been trained for this very purpose. This fact implies great responsibility, and confers a great privilege. Let them make themselves efficient and adept.

They should be "ensamples to the flock." While, it is true, no merely human being can be a perfect example, yet it is incumbent upon ministers of the gospel to live according to the principles of the gospel. If they do not, they will thwart the very purpose of the gospel of Chrsit.

They should be faithful pastors. "A house-going pastor makes a church-going people," said some one. Ministers should not dislike pastoral work. It is not a waste of time to visit the people of the parish, if the work is done judicially and as economically of time as possible.

Ministers should be good preachers. First, they should have the gospel in their hearts; then they should use every available means to train themselves in the fine art of pre-

senting it to the people forcefully and attractively. A good teacher in the art of public speaking will be able to correct certain natural faults that would otherwise greatly mar many a man's manner of public address.

As to the contents of the preaching, no better advice can be given than that of the apostle, "Preach the Word" (2 Tim. 4: 2). Not human speculation. "I am not ashamed of the gospel; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth" (Rom. 1: 16). "And I, brethren, when I came unto you," etc. (1 Cor. 2: 1-5; read the whole passage). The Word of God, the gospel of Christ, is the perennial theme for the preacher. It will furnish him with constant and ever-varied subjects for pulpit treatment. A prayerful, diligent and scholarly study of the Bible will prevent any minister from becoming monotonous and prosy as well as unspiritual, no matter how long a pastorate he may have. "Treasures new and old" are ever to be found therein. And, moreover, God's Word will not return unto Him void.

Nor does the foregoing imply that the minister should not be a wide student and reader; that he should not be versed, so far as other duties will permit, in science, literature and philosophy; in short, in all useful learning. However, all these studies should be subservient to the gospel. They should not be used didactically or pedantically, but simply to illustrate and enforce gospel truth. The Word of God is the main river; all other learning constitutes only the contributing streams to help "to make glad the city of God." If during the week the minister makes excursions up some of these tributaries, he should come back in the preparation and delivery of his sermon to the main river of revealed truth, bringing with him such treasures as he may have gathered. The sole use of erudition for the

preacher is to enable him to preach the gospel more effectively. With him knowledge and culture are means, not ends. Therefore he should make a homiletic use of all his acquisitions.

"Preach the Word." With all the preacher's general and special studies, his best homiletic method is to select his texts and themes from a direct study of the Bible, and not from other sources. "What shall I preach next Sunday?" is the minister's ever-recurring question at the beginning of the week. Some ministers make a mistake by seeking for texts and subjects in all sorts of literature; sometimes even consulting books of sermons and sermon-outlines. That, we feel impelled to say, is not the best way, not even a good way. It is better to read the Bible itself for texts and themes, especially when one is looking for the subject-matter of sermons. Every minister should be engaged at all times in a systematic study of the Bible or some portion of it. Such a method will furnish him with texts without number, so that he will never need to "run out" of material. In preaching on free texts a good method at times may be to read the Bible wherever one feels impelled to open it, not in a haphazard way, but with thought and purpose; then read it carefully, chapter by chapter, until the soul becomes filled with the glory of its message. Ere he is aware, he has found his text for the next Sunday; has grasped it, too, in its contextual connection, and thus is inspired with the fulness and largeness of its truth; then he should work it up into an outline that is all his own, not a borrowed one. One virtue of this plan for free texts is that it will lend variety to the minister's selection of subjects, and will save him from running into ruts. Another is that it will keep him a Biblical preacher.

And it is surprising, and most encouraging, too, to find how readily the profoundest doctrines of the gospel can be simplified, and brought to the comprehension of the common people. It is not a sign of true and profound culture for a preacher to be abstruse – "too deep," as the saying is. The deepest culture is that which is able to take the profound subjects of the gospel and make them luminous and transparent.

And preaching need not be juvenile and rudimentary in order to be clear. The great vital themes of the gospel are capable of simple treatment, if ministers will devoutly and unselfishly study to master the fine art of putting things lucidly in the vernacular. Do not try to be profound and erudite; try, rather, to be understood by all. Much so-called "deep" preaching is only obscure; often verbose and bombastic. Murky water always looks deep, though it may be very shallow. The preacher should not only use plain and simple language, but should cultivate the short sentence and the simple construction. Much so-called "hard reading" is so because the writers have formed the habit of using long and complex sentences that keep the mind on a constant strain. Terseness is a fine art; let us cultivate it.

In the true sense, preaching should always be ethical. Christ came to save His people from their sins, and salvation always means rescue from sin, cleansing from its pollution, and restoration to true righteousness. We cannot have too much ethical preaching of this kind, which insists that the only fountain of the truly moral life is redemption and regeneration.

There is great need today of the positive note in preaching. If a man has no real message for the world, he would better not enter the ministry. The pulpit that sends forth

an uncertain sound, or that expresses doubt about this and that and the other, will not build up the Church nor win men to Christ. All the great soul-winners and church-builders have been positive preachers. One of the best ways to preach the gospel is simply to take it for granted, and apply it as a positive panacea for the ills of humanity, without assuming the apologetic attitude at all. A preacher will not do the greatest amount of good by making constant mention of the negative critics, and exploiting the doubts they have raised about the Bible, even though he tries to refute them. These critical positions are known only to the learned few, anyway, and so ordinarily the preacher has no call to give them "free advertisement." While it is well for him to be posted on these critical problems, his main use for them will be in dealing privately with the doubts of the scholarly people in his parish and community. Before most audiences it is best to preach Christ and His gospel in a positive way as the only hope for man.

And what a field there is for positive preaching! Take the Christian virtue of faith – faith in God and in Christ – and how much inspiration there is in showing how good, strong, comforting and rational an act of the soul it is! In the same way the salutary power of the Christian hope can be proclaimed – the "hope that maketh not ashamed." So all the Christian graces and virtues can be treated in a positive way that is most bracing and uplifting.

The preaching must at times "cry aloud and spare not," as the prophet enjoins; but he should avoid the other extreme – that of constantly excoriating the sins and weaknesses of the people. It is a pity for any minister to gain a reputation of being a "*scolding*" preacher. Sometimes, yes, often, it would be well for him to remember the proph-

et's injunction: "Comfort ye my people; speak comfortably unto Jerusalem."

There is another way in which the true minister proves himself a valuable helper to his people. The art of expression is a fine art. Many parishioners do not possess it; they have been too busy with the toil of life to cultivate it. Yet in their hearts, far down in the deeps of their subconsciousness, there are thoughts and aspirations that are struggling for expression.

Now, here is the capable minister's opportunity. He studies religious problems and experiences; they are his specialty; to deal with them wisely and thoroughly – that has been the chief object of all his theological training. So, during the week he himself struggles with those thoughts, and by and by, he is able to put them into choice and telling phrases, and set them out like clear-cut cameos before his auditors, thus proving himself a true "master of assemblies." With grateful hearts, perhaps often with tear-dimmed eyes, they will say to him, "We have often thought of the very things you presented so clearly, but we couldn't express them; you have expressed them for us, and we thank you for the great help you have afforded us." Oh! what an opportunity for the preacher! No wonder the Holy Spirit inspired the maxim: "A word fitly spoken is like apples of gold in a network of silver" (Prov. 25: 11). "And further, because the Preacher was wise, he still taught the people knowledge; yea, he pondered, and sought out, and set in order many proverbs. The Preacher sought to find out acceptable words, and that which was written was uprightly, even the words of truth" (Eccl. 12: 9, 10).

(d) The relation of Church and State.

We are persuaded that our American principle is the

right one – the separation of the Church and the State. Where religion is free, it flourishes best. In such circumstances, too, is it most apt to be pure. Here in America no one needs to be a Christian unless he freely chooses to be one; and surely that principle makes for sincerity and spirituality.

There are points, however, at which the two institutions must function in harmony. For example, the people of the Church may proclaim the principles of public, civic and national righteousness, and may warn against sin, just as the prophets and apostles did of old. "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people." Christian people are also interested in the general civic, social and ethical welfare of the people in general.

Again, as citizens of the government, Christian people should exercise the right of suffrage, should pay their just taxes, should hold office when duty requires, and should perform all other obligations of citizenship in a republic. It is no mark of saintliness or the heavenly mind to remain away from the polls on election day.

On the other hand, the government should protect the Church in its property rights, just as it should secure the titles of other citizens and institutions. The rights of worship without molestation should also be guaranteed by the State. Tax-supported schools should teach nothing that is subversive of the sincere and sacred beliefs of its loyal and upright citizens.

But one thing should ever be remembered in this land. Religion should be free. No one should be compelled to attend church service or to be religious. Of course, we are referring now to adult citizens and their relation to the government. We believe that the vast majority of the

Christian citizens of our country are determinedly in favor of the present separation of the Church and the State.

(e) The Church militant and the Church triumphant.

It is a comfort to know that the battle for every true church member will end in victory. There may be people who profess to believe that the struggle with sin and misery will continue forever; but it is hard to think that they are really in earnest. It would be an intolerable thought. No; it is far better to believe that "Christ hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." To know that "there remaineth a rest for the people of God" is a comfort to many weary toilers. "A house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens," surely has its attractions for people who have been restored to the normal state of mind by the gospel of Christ. To know that we "are the children of God, and if children, then heirs, heirs of God and joint-heirs with Jesus Christ," is surely a powerful, pure and inspiring incentive to trust God and to serve Him with loyal devotion.

Of faithful members of the Church militant it may be said that, at death, they simply transfer their membership to the Church triumphant, to the General Assembly and Church of the First-born in heaven.

This concludes our study of Christian Ethics, as far as our purpose justifies us in developing it. Many subjects, especially in Practical Ethics, are capable of almost indefinite expansion; but in this treatise our aim has been to make the discussions suggestive rather than exhaustive. The unity of the system lies in these patent facts: that the ethical is grounded in the nature, will and personality of

God; that this personal God, through His inspired Word, reveals to man His love and grace in His incarnate Son, our Redeemer and Lord; that through faith in Christ and His redemption, applied by the Holy Spirit, the glorious merit and righteousness of the Saviour are imputed to the believer, and the divine ethical power and grace are implanted in his innermost character, transfiguring it with ethical potency; and that this "new creation," from its very nature, bears the fruitage of a sincere and well-ordered life before God and man. We know of no other ultimate ethical ground; no other method of receiving ethical salvation; no other way of realizing the true ethical ideal and destiny.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

ADAM, D. S.— *A Handbook of Christian Ethics.*

ALEXANDER, A. B. D.— *Christianity and Ethics.*

DAVIDSON, W. L.— *Christian Ethics.*

D'ARCY, C. F.— *Christian Ethics and Modern Thought.*

DORNER, J. A.— *A System of Christian Ethics.*

GARDNER, C. S.— *The Ethics of Jesus and Social Progress.*

GREGORY, D. S.— *Christian Ethics.*

HAAS, J. A. W.— *Freedom and Christian Conduct: An Ethic.*

HAERING, T.— *Ethics of the Christian Life.*

HARLESS, C. A.— *A System of Christian Ethics.*

KENDRICK, A. C.— *The Moral Conflict of Christianity.*

LUTHARDT, C. E.— *History of Christian Ethics; Moral Truths of Christianity; Kompendium der Theologischen Ethik.*

MACKINTOSCH, R.— *Christianity and Sin.*

MARTENSEN, A.— *Christian Ethics* (three volumes).

MURRAY, J. C.— *A Handbook of Christian Ethics.*

ROBINS, H. E.— *The Ethics of the Christian Life.*

ROOP, H. U.— *Christian Ethics, or the Science of Christian Living.*

SARTORIUS, E.— *The Doctrine of Divine Love.*

SMYTH, N.— *Christian Ethics.*

STALKER, J.— *The Ethics of Jesus; Imago Christi.*

STRONG, T. B.— *Bampton Lectures on Christian Ethics.*

WEIDNER, R. F.— *Christian Ethics* (based on Martensen).

WUTTKE, A.— *Christian Ethics.*

Other timely volumes by the same author

A SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE

You will agree, we believe, that the issue of the *Ninth Edition* of any book is an event of no small significance. It certainly proves that the work is of a vital and interesting character. It is gratifying to both the author and the publishers of Dr. Keyser's book that there has been a constant and increasing demand for so strongly an evangelical publication. It is being used as a textbook in *Bible Schools, Colleges, and Theological Seminaries.*

Cloth, 290 Pages; $2.50

THE PHILOSOPHY OF CHRISTIANITY

"This work deals with some of the fundamental problems involved in the Christian view of world. It is Christianity's outlook on life's problems that stand out in this volume. The reasonableness and adequacy of the Christian world view are maintained throughout, and while one may feel at times that the author goes rather far in rationalizing Christianity, one must ever bear in mind the fact that he stands four-square upon Biblical grounds basically. There are a number of things in the book to which special attention might be called, but time and space will not permit it at present. It is a book that we have needed, and one that I am sure will be read both with interest and appreciation as well as with profit, not only by the theological student and pastor, but also by the intelligent lay Christian."—G. M. B., Lutheran Church Herald.

Cloth, 266 Pages; Price $2.50

A SYSTEM OF GENERAL ETHICS

A Timely Book (Fifth Edition)

"UP-TO-DATE," "SCIENTIFIC," "SAFE," "SOUND," "CLEAR," "STRIKINGLY PERSUASIVE."

This book by Dr. Keyser teaches the right kind of morality, the only kind that will stand the acid test of these crucial times. It is stalwart, scientific, based on sound philosophical principles, and eminently timely and practical.

Cloth, 240 Pages; Price $2.25

Other timely volumes by the same author

A BOOK FOR THESE TIMES! A BOOK FOR ALL TIMES!

A SYSTEM OF NATURAL THEISM

Second Edition of a Notable Book

The material of the work is so classified as to make the work an admirable one for a textbook in colleges and theological seminaries, in which kind of schools the first edition has been largely used. This second edition, the Publishers are convinced, is still better adapted for such academic purposes.

At the same time it is a work that will please and benefit the general reader who desires to see how clearly and convincingly the proofs for the divine existence and character can be presented, and how greatly belief in God enhances and irradiates life and gives it a meaning that is worth while. People who have become agnostical should read the book; college and seminary presidents and professors are cordially invited to examine it. The discipline of Theism ought to have a place in every curriculum, and especially in our Christian schools. Cloth, 160 Pages; Price $1.50

A HANDBOOK OF CHRISTIAN PSYCHOLOGY

After defining the terms employed, the author of this book discusses Biblical psychology and shows that man is a Dual Being. His definitions of the psychical terms in the Bible are valuable. Man was a psychical being at the beginning and fell, and needs to be saved. The Bible and true science are in accord. The anti-Christian theories are explained and rejected. The analysis of the human mind is a valuable contribution to the subject.

Cloth, 168 Pages; Price $1.50

THE CONFLICT OF FUNDAMENTALISM AND MODERNISM

A tract for the times. 30 cents per copy.

"The chief purpose of the author has been to set forth as accurately as possible the real issue and crisis in the Christian Church today, and to draw the picture so clearly that the layman, as well as the person who is theologically trained, may see just what the controversy is about."

9470
171.4
K523m Keyser, Leander S.
AUTHOR
A Manual of Christian
TITLE
Ethics
DATE DUE BORROWER'S NAME

9470
171.4
K523m

~~241.02~~
Key

A Manual of Christian Ethics

Library
The Master's College
Santa Clarita, CA 91322-0878

Date Due

JAN.25 63			
DEC 12 '79			

Library Bureau Cat. No. 1137

THE MASTER'S COLLEGE
171.4 K523m MAIN
Keyser, Leander Syl/A manual of Christia
3 3540 00002 5497